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Foreword

Uganda’s economic and political stability over the past two decades has brought unprecedented opportunities to address social inequalities and improve the well-being of citizens. Investments in key human development areas have reaped benefits in poverty reduction, and seen some improvements on a range of socio-economic indicators: but is everyone benefiting?

Ugandan women and girls have partially benefited from these trends. New laws and measures to protect and promote women’s economic, political and human rights have been accompanied by impressive reductions in gender gaps in primary and secondary education and greater female political participation. Yet, wide gender gaps and inequalities remain, including in control of assets, employment and health. Economic development may have improved the status quo of women in Uganda, but full equality with men remains a distant reality.

Tackling the discriminatory social norms that drive such gender inequalities and ensuring that women can equally benefit from Uganda’s development were twin objectives of this first in-depth country study of the OECD Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI). The SIGI is the first composite measure of gender equality that captures the root causes behind unequal outcomes for women. Uganda represents the first country where the index has been built and applied both nationally and at the sub-national level.

This Uganda SIGI Country Report presents the results of a two-year partnership between the OECD Development Centre and the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS), supported by the Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC). This country report brings together the key results and findings of the SIGI by region and by thematic sub-index, complementing the Uganda Bureau of Statistics’ own survey report.

Data and analysis presented in this report aim first and foremost to provide policy makers with tools and evidence to design more effective gender-responsive policies and interventions. The Uganda-SIGI results show how discrimination against women interacts with a variety of factors, such as rural/urban differences or education levels, to shape women’s development pathways. Over two years, qualitative studies, household surveys, national consultations and focus groups were conducted to produce the first data on social institutions across the 112 districts of Uganda.

The partnership between UBOS and the OECD Development Centre has helped to build new knowledge and capacity on measuring gender equality and social norms. This evidence base represents not just a “first” for Uganda but a “first” internationally, with important implications for advancing national as well as global understanding of the relationship between discriminatory social institutions, gender equality and development.
As the development community looks forward to implementation of the post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), this fruitful collaboration underscores the multiple reciprocal advantages of such international technical exchanges to capture, benchmark and analyse the root causes of inequality. The OECD Development Centre remains committed to invest in evidence on social norms and gender equality as a contribution to global debates and national policy making for more equal societies for all.

Mario Pezzini
Director,
OECD Development Centre
Acknowledgements

The Uganda Social Institutions and Gender Index was prepared by the OECD Development Centre’s Social Cohesion Unit: Alexandre Kolev, Gaëlle Ferrant, Francesco Granella and Keiko Nowacka.

The OECD Development Centre would like to thank the Austrian Development Cooperation for its strong support of the Uganda Social Institutions and Gender Index and the Ugandan Bureau of Statistics for its collaboration: Ben Paul Mungyereza (Executive Director); Norah Madaya (Director, Statistical Co-ordination Services); Vincent Fred Ssennono (Principal Statistician, Methods and Analysis); James Muwonge (Director, Social Economic Surveys); Diana Byanjeru (Senior Officer, Gender); Angela Kiconco (Senior Statistician, Analysis); Stella Nassolo (Gender Statistician); Imelda Atai Musana (Deputy Executive Director, Statistical Production and Development); Johnson Kagugube (Director, District Statistics and Capacity Development); Grace Bulenzi Gulere (Principal Officer, Statistical Co-ordination); Ronald Ssombwe (Principal Statistician, Quality Assurance); James Bindya (Principal Statistician, Capacity Development); Rachel Namboozo (Senior Statistician, Community Information System); Monica Rutahanda (Statistician); Kenneth Bateesa (Surveys Assistant).

The OECD Development Centre would like to thank the following individuals and organisations for their co-operation and expertise: the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development of Uganda; Rosemarie Nalwadda (independent consultant); Jane Ekapu (Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development); Jackson Atria (UN NGO Forum); Emmanuel Mugole (UN NGO Forum), as well as members of the technical advisory group: Consolata Kabonesa (School of Women and Gender Studies, Makerere University); Firmina Acuba (Ministry of Water and Environment); Sylvia Tereka (Consultant); Nancy Abwola (Raising Voices); Grace Bantebya (School of Women and Gender Studies, Makerere University); Lillian Mpabulungi (CARE Uganda); Annet Kabarungi (Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development); Ronald Kalyango (School of Women and Gender Studies, Makerere University); Josephine Nansubuga (United Nations Development Programme).

The OECD Development Centre would also like to acknowledge the participants of the two national workshops.

Particular thanks to Debbie Budlender and Somali Cerise (UN Women).
Table of contents

Acronyms and abbreviations .......................................................................................................................... 11
Executive summary ........................................................................................................................................ 13
  Key findings ........................................................................................................................................ 13
  Key messages .................................................................................................................................. 15
  Policy recommendations .................................................................................................................. 16
  Note .................................................................................................................................................. 18
Introduction .................................................................................................................................................. 19
  An overview of the status of women in Uganda ............................................................................ 19
  An overview of the global SIGI results for sub-Saharan Africa ................................................. 21
  The Uganda-SIGI .............................................................................................................................. 23
  Notes ................................................................................................................................................. 25
The construction of the Uganda-SIGI and its sub-indices ............................................................................. 27
  Step 1: Data collection ..................................................................................................................... 27
  Step 2: Construction of the sub-indices ............................................................................................ 28
  Step 3: Computing the Uganda-SIGI ............................................................................................... 32
  Uganda-SIGI classification ................................................................................................................. 33
  Notes ................................................................................................................................................. 33
RESULTS .................................................................................................................................................. 35
Uganda-SIGI ............................................................................................................................................ 37
  Regional performances ..................................................................................................................... 38
  Education and changing gender norms .......................................................................................... 39
  Trends across the Uganda-SIGI sub-indices .................................................................................... 39
  Classification of regions in the Uganda-SIGI .................................................................................. 41
  Note ................................................................................................................................................ 42
SUB-INDEX ANALYSIS ............................................................................................................................ 43
Discriminatory family code ............................................................................................................................ 45
  What does the discriminatory family code sub-index capture? .................................................... 45
  Why is this important for development and for gender equality? ........................................... 45
  How does the Uganda-SIGI measure discriminatory family code? ......................................... 47
  How does Uganda perform in the discriminatory family code sub-index? ............................ 47
  Notes ................................................................................................................................................. 51
Restricted physical integrity ................................................................. 53
What does the restricted physical integrity sub-index measure? .......... 53
Why is this important for development and for gender equality? ...... 53
How does the Uganda-SIGI measure restricted physical integrity? .. 54
How does Uganda perform in the restricted physical integrity sub-index? 55
Notes ........................................................................................................ 58

Son preference ......................................................................................... 59
What does the son preference sub-index capture? ......................... 59
Why is this important for development and gender equality? ...... 59
How does the Uganda-SIGI measure son preference? ................. 60
How does Uganda perform in the son preference sub-index? ......... 61

Restricted resources and assets ............................................................ 65
What does the restricted resources and assets sub-index measure? .. 65
Why is this important for development and gender equality? ...... 65
How does the Uganda-SIGI measure restricted resources and assets? 66
How does Uganda perform in the restricted resources and assets sub-index? 67
Notes ........................................................................................................ 71

Restricted civil liberties ......................................................................... 73
What does the restricted civil liberties sub-index measure? ......... 73
Why is this important for development and gender equality? ...... 73
How does the Uganda-SIGI measure restricted civil liberties? ..... 75
How does Uganda perform in the restricted civil liberties sub-index? 75
Notes ........................................................................................................ 79

REGIONAL ANALYSIS .............................................................................. 81

Kampala ................................................................................................. 83
Discriminatory family code ................................................................. 85
Restricted physical integrity ................................................................. 86
Son preference ..................................................................................... 86
Restricted resources and assets .......................................................... 87
Restricted civil liberties ...................................................................... 87

Central ................................................................................................. 89
Discriminatory family code ................................................................. 91
Restricted physical integrity ................................................................. 92
Son preference ..................................................................................... 93
Restricted resources and assets .......................................................... 93
Restricted civil liberties ...................................................................... 94

Eastern ................................................................................................. 95
Discriminatory family code ................................................................. 97
Restricted physical integrity ................................................................. 98
Son preference ..................................................................................... 99
Restricted resources and assets .......................................................... 99
Restricted civil liberties ...................................................................... 100
TABLE OF CONTENTS – 9

Northern........................................................................................................................................ 101
Discriminatory family code ........................................................................................................ 103
Restricted physical integrity ..................................................................................................... 104
Son preference ........................................................................................................................... 104
Restricted resources and assets ................................................................................................ 105
Restricted civil liberties ............................................................................................................ 105

Western.......................................................................................................................................... 107
Discriminatory family code ........................................................................................................ 109
Restricted physical integrity ..................................................................................................... 110
Son bias ....................................................................................................................................... 110
Restricted resources and assets ................................................................................................ 111
Restricted civil liberties ............................................................................................................ 111

ANNEXES ..................................................................................................................................... 113
Annex A The Uganda-SIGI Survey ............................................................................................. 115
The sample .................................................................................................................................. 115
Focus group discussions and key informant interviews ............................................................... 116
The questionnaire ........................................................................................................................ 117

Annex B Uganda-SIGI indicator dashboard .............................................................................. 119

Annex C Correlation results .................................................................................................... 125

References ..................................................................................................................................... 127
Glossary ......................................................................................................................................... 131

Tables
Table 1. Composition of the indicator measuring discrimination against women’s inheritance... 29
Table 2. Cronbach alpha coefficient by sub-indices .................................................................... 30
Table 3. Principal component analysis weights by sub-indices .................................................. 32
Table 4. Uganda-SIGI classification: Thresholds ..................................................................... 33
Table 5. Results of the Uganda-SIGI and its sub-indices ............................................................ 39
Table 6. Uganda-SIGI classification: Results ........................................................................... 41
Table 7. Selected discriminatory family code variables .............................................................. 51
Table 8. Average out-of-pocket cost of one-time service use ...................................................... 54
Table 9. Selected restricted physical integrity variables ............................................................. 58
Table 10. Selected son preference variables .............................................................................. 64
Table 11. Selected restricted resources and assets variables ..................................................... 70
Table 12. Selected restricted civil liberties variables ................................................................. 78
Table 13. Regional socio-demographic characteristics of Kampala ........................................... 83
Table 14. Regional socio-demographic characteristics of the Central region ............................ 89
Table 15. Regional socio-demographic characteristics of the Eastern region ............................ 95
Table 16. Regional socio-demographic characteristics of the Northern region .......................... 101
Table 17. Regional socio-demographic characteristics of the Western region ........................... 107
Table 18. Indicators and variables of the Uganda-SIGI ............................................................... 119
Table 19. Pearson’s correlation coefficients .............................................................................. 125
Figures

Figure 1. The 2014 SIGI results: Uganda, top and lowest performances in sub-Saharan Africa .............................................................................................................................. 21
Figure 2. The 2014 SIGI results: An east African overview .......................................................................................................................... 23
Figure 3. The composition of the Ugandan Social Institutions and Gender Index ...................................................... 25
Figure 4. Uganda-SIGI score in Uganda sub-regions ......................................................................................... 37
Figure 5. Uganda-SIGI scores by sub-index ......................................................................................................................... 40
Figure 6. Higher discrimination within the family code, higher son preference ..................................................... 40
Figure 7. Share of Ugandan population by level of discrimination in the Uganda-SIGI ........................................ 41
Figure 8. Regional scores in the Uganda-SIGI sub-indices by level of discrimination in the Uganda-SIGI .................. 42
Figure 9. Attitudes and prevalence of early marriage, and female secondary education ................................... 46
Figure 10. Discriminatory family code scores in Ugandan sub-regions ................................................................. 47
Figure 11. Regional disparities in the discriminatory family code indicators ......................................................... 49
Figure 12. More opinions justifying spousal violence against women, higher prevalence ..................................... 53
Figure 13. Restricted physical integrity scores in Ugandan sub-regions ................................................................. 55
Figure 14. Regional disparities in the physical integrity indicators ............................................................................... 56
Figure 15. Higher preference for son, higher gender gaps in education ................................................................. 60
Figure 16. Son preference scores in Ugandan sub-regions ......................................................................................... 61
Figure 17. Regional disparities in the son preference indicators ................................................................................... 62
Figure 18. Higher restrictions on women’s access to land ownership, higher restrictions on financial services ................................................................. 66
Figure 19. Restricted resources and assets in Ugandan sub-regions ............................................................................. 67
Figure 20. Regional disparities in the restricted resources and assets indicators ...................................................... 68
Figure 21. Attitudes, women’s political participation and governance ......................................................................... 74
Figure 22. Restricted civil liberties scores in Ugandan sub-regions ............................................................................. 75
Figure 23. Regional disparities in the restricted civil liberties indicators ........................................................................ 76
Figure 24. Uganda-SIGI classification in the Kampala region ......................................................................................... 84
Figure 25. Uganda-SIGI and its sub-indices in the Kampala region .............................................................................. 85
Figure 26. Uganda-SIGI classification in the Central region ......................................................................................... 90
Figure 27. Uganda-SIGI and its sub-indices in the Central region ................................................................................... 91
Figure 28. Uganda-SIGI classification in the Eastern region ......................................................................................... 96
Figure 29. Uganda-SIGI and its sub-indices in the Eastern region ................................................................................... 97
Figure 30. Uganda-SIGI classification in the Northern region ...................................................................................... 102
Figure 31. Uganda-SIGI and its sub-indices in the Northern region ............................................................................ 103
Figure 32. Uganda-SIGI classification in the Western region ...................................................................................... 108
Figure 33. Uganda-SIGI and its sub-indices in the Western region ............................................................................ 109
### Acronyms and abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADC</td>
<td>Austrian Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Chief Administrative Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAO</td>
<td>Deputy Chief Administrative Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Demographic and Health Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGM</td>
<td>Female Genital Mutilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC</td>
<td>First Principal Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPI</td>
<td>Gender Parity Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRW</td>
<td>International Center for Research on Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labor Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI</td>
<td>Multidimensional Poverty Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>Principal Component Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGI</td>
<td>Social Institutions and Gender Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBOS</td>
<td>Uganda Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPF</td>
<td>Uganda Police Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPPAP</td>
<td>Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIGI</td>
<td>Uganda Social Institutions and Gender Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAI</td>
<td>Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

With the support of the Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC), the OECD Development Centre and the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) launched the first country pilot of the Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) in Uganda in 2013 to strengthen national policy making aimed at tackling the root causes of gender inequalities. The Uganda-SIGI provides policy makers, civil society and the development community with a comprehensive database of information on discriminatory social institutions at the sub-national level. For the first time, discriminatory laws (formal and informal), attitudes, norms and practices have been recorded and quantified across the different regions of Uganda, putting the spotlight on the effects of discrimination on gender inequalities, poverty and the marginalisation of women.

Through a rigorous methodology and participatory approach with a range of stakeholders, the Uganda-SIGI provides the first data on the instances and intensity of discrimination against women at the sub-national level. The results highlight how regional disparities at the sub-national level are often hidden by national-level statistics, and the importance of designing policies that specifically target local issues and involve community actions. New data on discriminatory social institutions across 112 districts of Uganda brings to light the urgency to include social norms into policy approaches aimed at empowering women and eliminating gender inequalities at both the local and national levels.

Key findings

The Uganda-SIGI shows that investments in reducing gender inequalities hold important potential to improve women’s rights and reduce gender gaps. Over the past two decades, Uganda has achieved solid progress, courtesy of comprehensive laws and policies strengthening women’s political participation and land rights, among others.

However, gaps and challenges remain across some key areas affecting women’s rights. Gaps between opinions, perceived and actual practices highlight the urgency to tackle discriminatory social institutions through a multi-pronged and holistic approach.

Some of the key trends and figures from the Uganda-SIGI are presented below, highlighting the persistent challenge of discriminatory social institutions.

**Discriminatory family code**

**Early marriage:** The number of early marriages is decreasing in Uganda, but the practice remains pervasive and widely accepted, especially in the East Central, Mid-Eastern and Mid-Northern sub-regions. Marriage is delayed: the median age of first union is 18.9 for the cohort of women aged 20-24 years old compared to 17.9 for the 45-49-year-old cohort.
However, on average one in two women was married before turning 18, up to two in three women in the East Central, Mid-Eastern and Mid-Northern sub-regions. Early marriage is widely accepted, but only for girls: 45% of respondents declare that girls should be married by 18, while 85% believe that men should be married later.

**Restricted physical integrity**

**Domestic violence:** Uganda recently rolled out innovative programmes, coupled with strong legislative initiatives to reduce the harmful practice of intimate partner violence. While 60% of women had experienced (physical and/or sexual) domestic violence in 2006, the figure dropped to 50% in 2011.

However, intimate partner violence prevalence and acceptance are still high, with women the principal victims. Twice as many women than men experienced spousal violence in their lifetime: one in two Ugandan women have experienced spousal violence at least once in their lifetime and one in three in the last 12 months. Social norms justifying violence against women help explain such high prevalence rates amongst women: more than half of Ugandans (57%) agree that domestic violence against women is justified under certain circumstances. This number is as much as two-thirds of the population in the West Nile and Mid-Eastern sub-regions.

**Son preference**

**Caring responsibilities:** Traditional gender roles are transmitted across generations with many Ugandans agreeing that girls and boys should not have the same share of caring responsibilities. Half of the population reports that girls perform more housework than boys even though only one-third thinks that such inequalities are justified. In addition to time discrepancies, the activities assigned to each gender differ. Typically, girls are responsible for domestic activities such as caring and cooking, which are activities attached to the domestic and reproductive function of women. In contrast, boys accomplish heavy physical work, such as digging or construction of the dwelling. Half of the population associates unpaid housework with girls although only one-third thinks such inequalities are justified.

**Restricted resources and assets**

**Secure access to land:** Land rights and management remain largely attributed to men. Women represent one-third of owners or co-owners of land, with the notable case of Kampala, where women represent only 18% of land owners. This discriminatory practice is supported by discriminatory opinions: 27% of the population supports unequal rights to land for women and men, reaching as much as 54% in the Mid-Northern sub-region.

**Restricted civil liberties**

**Access to justice:** Securing women’s civil liberties and rights remains a challenge, in particular in the Southwest region of Uganda. One-third of the population reports that women do not enjoy the same opportunities as men to access justice, i.e. police, courts of law and local traditional authorities; this rises to 60% in the Southwest sub-region.
Key messages

1. Discriminatory social norms in Uganda intersect and overlap to reinforce women’s marginalisation

Discriminatory social institutions have multiple negative impacts on women’s rights, empowerment and well-being, which interlock and compound their deprivation in other dimensions of social institutions. Discrimination is not isolated: the Uganda-SIGI results highlight that discrimination in one form of social institution spills over into the others. For example, discrimination against the girl child in the son preference sub-index has a catalytic role throughout a woman’s life, with evidence suggesting correlations with decreased decision-making status within the family. Discriminatory customary laws, such as inheritance practices, will also strongly determine whether a woman can enjoy secure rights to land and assets.

Importantly, the Uganda-SIGI also shows the positive multiplier effects for women and gender equality when discrimination is eliminated or reduced. Condemnation of early marriage for girls is correlated with lower prevalence rates and higher levels of female education.

2. Improving levels of development provide better protections for women’s rights, empowerment and well-being but do not guarantee equality

The Uganda-SIGI results indicate that higher levels of education amongst communities are related to more positive attitudes and practices on gender equality and women’s rights. In Uganda, this represents promising opportunities to transform discriminatory social norms around gender equality. Increasing levels of secondary education of both women and men appears to boost support for gender equality and women’s empowerment. With a national average of 29% of Ugandans completing lower secondary education in 2013 (World Bank, n.d.), there is encouraging potential that further improvements in educational outcomes will be accompanied by more support of gender equality.

However, higher levels of education or income alone will not automatically lead to higher levels of gender equality. Although the two regions with the lowest level of poverty, Kampala and Central, are also the two top performers of the Uganda-SIGI, the good performance of other regions is not correlated with their level of prosperity. The Eastern region, for example, is one of the poorest in Uganda with 25% of poor households (UBOS, 2013) but is the third best performer in the Uganda-SIGI. Conversely, the Western region has a low incidence of poverty (8.7% of the population) but very high levels of discrimination in social institutions. This complex scenario suggests that positively transforming social norms may benefit from but cannot depend on improving levels of development: gender equality requires targeted and specific gender-transformative measures.

3. Entrenched acceptance of discriminatory social norms by communities, including women, undermine gender equality

Progress towards gender equality is cut short by widespread acceptance of discriminatory social institutions, including by women and girls. The Uganda-SIGI results highlight that discriminatory practices such as early marriage, unequal distribution of unpaid care work or negative perceptions on women as political leaders are upheld by
attitudes, shared by women and men, that this is justified and acceptable. Female acceptance of inequality not only reduces scope for embedded discriminatory practices and attitudes to be challenged by women themselves, it also reinforces the transmission of discrimination across generations.

The Uganda-SIGI also puts the spotlight on the mismatch between positive attitudes towards equality and actual practices. Even when communities do hold favourable views towards women’s land ownership or political participation, for example, the reality continues to reflect a picture of inequality. Identifying the factors driving such gaps is important for establishing policies or interventions to overcome the obstacles in turning positive views into equality.

4. Sub-national data counts for progress on gender equality

The Uganda-SIGI showcases why one size does not fit all when it comes to policy responses to eliminating discrimination and inequality. The Uganda-SIGI’s sub-national data and analysis provide unique detailed snapshots of the regional variations of discriminatory social institutions across Uganda. For the first time, evidence on how discrimination against women changes according to region, income or education level is available, allowing unprecedented opportunities to sharpen policy responses and interventions directly targeting problem areas. Furthermore, such data will have additional value for explaining and addressing bottlenecks in development areas, such as health and education.

Moreover, better data on social institutions bring to light the enabling factors for promoting equality. “Success stories” emerge from the Uganda-SIGI results: for example, the introduction of the 2006 Electoral Law appears to have made important inroads in changing views of women in public life. The links between education and support for equality, or son preference and women’s status within the family provide new guidance on policy pathways for further action.

Policy recommendations

1. Close the legal loopholes that weaken women’s rights and perpetuate gender inequalities

Uganda’s extensive legislative framework on gender equality has brought about real and substantive improvements in women’s rights and well-being over the past decade. However, loopholes remain which undermine the legislative progress, and expose women and girls to ongoing discrimination.

Harmonising customary laws with national laws in line with Uganda’s international human rights’ commitments (e.g. CEDAW) would significantly improve women’s rights. For example, early marriage prevalence rates remain high (62% in the Eastern region of Uganda) due to the direct contradictions between the 1973 Customary Marriage Act and the Constitution on the legal age of marriage for girls. Harmonising these laws by removing discrimination would have direct benefits for girls by challenging the social expectation that they should marry before the age of 18 (accepted by 45% of Ugandans), and provide more chances for them to pursue their education and economic empowerment pathways. Similarly, the efficacy of the 2004 Land Act to boost women’s land rights and ownership is circumscribed by customary laws and practices, which restrict their rights to inherit or own land and assets, and have wide-ranging adverse effects on women’s economic empowerment. Women’s access to justice could further be
strengthened by ensuring that only national laws are respected and prevail in the formal court system.

2. Tailor policies, interventions and services to meet the specific needs of women and their communities

The Uganda-SIGI results demonstrate the diversity of opportunities and challenges for women’s rights and gender equality across the country. While national laws have made inroads in addressing gender inequalities, clear regional differences highlight issues in the implementation of laws and the delivery of services.

The sub-national differences in the levels of discrimination against women exposed by the Uganda-SIGI point to the need for policy responses that take into account regional specificities in terms of norms and needs. This has implications for the allocation of services and investments: for example, establishing or increasing the number of women’s shelters in regions with high levels of domestic violence such as the Northern region, or promoting land registration campaigns amongst communities where women have low legal literacy and formal access to land and credit.

3. Design holistic gender-responsive policies to tackle the matrix of discrimination across a woman’s life

The Uganda-SIGI brings to the fore how discriminatory social institutions interact within a complex matrix that reinforce gender inequalities and compound women’s deprivation and marginalization. However, breaking this matrix of disempowerment and discrimination can be achieved through gender-responsive policies that put a woman’s life course at the centre of action.

Policies targeting the elimination of gender-based discrimination in one or more dimensions of social institutions (i.e. early marriage, access to land, sexual and reproductive health and rights) may also affect the level of restrictions women face in other dimensions. As shown in the Uganda-SIGI results, preferences for boys have long-term adverse consequences for girls and women throughout the course of their lives: there is a positive correlation between son preference and women’s lower status within the family, suggesting that regions having high levels of discrimination against the girl child also have high levels of discrimination against women within the family code. For this reason, targeting isolated dimensions and neglecting others in a policy intervention may lead to unexpected (and undesired) outcomes, or prove to be less efficient in promoting women’s empowerment. For example, policies aiming to increase women’s decision making within the family will be undermined by social norms that strongly favour boys. Untangling the discriminatory chains within such a matrix is imperative to increase efficiency of policies and actions.

4. Invest in regular collection of data to benchmark and monitor gender equality

The Uganda-SIGI provides the first database and benchmark of the status quo of social norms on gender equality in Uganda at the sub-national level. Establishing a comprehensive monitoring framework on gender equality that tracks trends and impacts on social norms can better support policy making and increase understanding of “what works” to achieve social transformation and gender equality.
Uganda is in a strong position to monitor the efficacy and impacts of laws and policies promoting gender equality and women’s rights. Sex-disaggregation of data is mainstreamed through many of UBOS’ reports and data analysis, providing important information on gender gaps in the economy, education or health. This can be complemented and reinforced through the integration of social norms within the statistical system to capture changes in social norms. Indeed, mainstreaming social norms indicators will prove essential for reporting commitments within the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) framework; indeed, the Uganda-SIGI survey covers most of the targets under SDG 5 on gender equality and women’s empowerment.

Note

1. The poverty headcount P0 indicator is used here to show the extent of poverty. More precisely it measures the percentage of individuals estimated to be living in households with real private consumption per adult equivalent below the poverty line for their region. At national level a P0 of 19.7 implies that 19.7% of Ugandans are estimated to live in households which spend less than what is necessary to meet their caloric requirements and to afford them a mark-up for non-food needs.
Introduction

In March 2015, Uganda celebrated International Women’s Day with the theme “Empowerment of Women and Girls is Progress for All: Three Decades of Gains for Ugandan Women and Girls”. A stocktaking of progress demonstrates the clear improvements in women’s rights and well-being in Uganda, which reflect the long-term benefits of public investment in legal, institutional and policy reform. Impressive progress has been achieved in reducing gender gaps and inequalities in education and political life, with more women able to better benefit from Uganda’s economic growth and stability. Challenges remain in women’s economic empowerment and health, and ongoing gender inequalities point to the need for holistic policy making that takes into account the role of discriminatory social norms.

An overview of the status of women in Uganda

Economic growth, political stability and expanding opportunities have brought some, albeit limited, advantages for women and girls in Uganda. Legislative frameworks protecting women’s rights and promoting gender equality have seen some positive outcomes but have not reached their full potential. Customary laws and practices, as well as social norms, continue to adversely impact the implementation and efficacy of these laws at the sub-national level.

The legislative framework and institutional mechanisms for gender equality

Since the 1990s, Uganda has reinforced its policy framework to be both gender equal and gender responsive, and to support women’s empowerment. At the international level, Uganda ratified the CEDAW in 1985 and the Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa (Maputo Protocol) in 2010. In addition, Uganda is a signatory to the African Union Solemn Declaration on Gender Equality in Africa, ratified in 2009, and the Goma Declaration on Eradicating Sexual Violence and Ending Impunity in the Great Lakes Region (June 2008; Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, 2008). The Constitution provides the foundation of the national framework which prohibits all forms of discrimination against women and provides for the protection and promotion of women’s rights.

The Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development is tasked with promoting gender equality and gender-responsive development. The Uganda Gender Policy of 2007-17 outlines the commitment of the government of Uganda to gender equality and serves as a guide for gender mainstreaming at all levels (Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, 2008).

Harmonisation and alignment of the pluri-legal systems within Uganda have had limited results, creating loopholes that weaken women’s rights within the family. For example, while the Constitution sets the legal age of marriage at 18 for both women and men, the 1973 Customary Marriage Act (Chapter 248) sets the age at 16 for women and 18 for men. Although the Constitution prevails (Article 2(2), high prevalence rates and
acceptance of early marriage in Uganda indicate the strength of customary practices over national laws. Similarly, constitutional recognition of women’s equal rights within marriage, to parental authority and to initiate divorce are undermined by customary laws. Under the Marriage Act, widows have the right to inherit only 15% of a deceased husband’s property; however, under customary law, women do not have the right to inherit.

New laws protecting women from gender-based violence have been introduced over the past ten years. The Domestic Violence Act (2010) provides a comprehensive definition of domestic violence that includes physical, sexual, emotional, verbal, psychological and economic violence as well as harassment. In addition, the bill provides protection orders for abused women, which had not previously existed in Ugandan law. Rape is a criminal offence in Uganda under the Penal Code, which also prescribes the death penalty for those convicted of rape. Spousal rape is not addressed in the Penal Code.

While many laws recognise equality between women and men, few specifically protect women’s economic rights. The 2004 Land Act was designed to improve women’s access to land and grant them the right to manage their property. However, prevalence of customary laws, lack of inheritance rights and recognition of co-ownership weakens women’s ability to own and manage land and non-land assets.

**Political representation and voice**

Uganda has one of the highest rates of women’s political participation in the eastern African region due in large part to constitutional provisions and the 2006 Electoral Law establishing quotas for women at the national and sub-national levels (OECD, 2014c). As of 2014, 35% of seats in the national parliament, one-fifth of Cabinet positions and 32% of parliamentary committee chairs were filled by women (The Quota Project, 2014; Kyomuhendo Bantebya et al., 2013). In comparison, women represent 64% of members of parliament in Rwanda, 39% in Mozambique, 19% in Kenya and Mauritius, and 12% in Zambia. Women have also been promoted to lead key ministries in Uganda including the Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Sports; Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development; and Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives; and were previously in other key ministries such as the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (until 2015); the Ministry of Health (until 2013); the Ministry of Water and Environment (until 2013). The politics of inclusion of women in local government has led to changes: thanks to the specific quota (minimum one-third of local councils must be women), 42% of district counsellors are women. However, few women are appointed to the highest positions in the districts: only 11 chief administrative officers out of the 112 are women, and only 2 chairpersons out of the 112 districts are women.9

**Education**

Uganda has made mixed progress towards gender equality in education. Gender parity in primary education has almost been achieved, with 91% of the school-age population being enrolled. However, female literacy rates lag behind those of males (49% compared to 69%) and gender gaps widen at secondary and tertiary school: 85 and 78 girls were enrolled in secondary and tertiary school respectively for 100 boys in 2011. Hence the country is not on track in meeting the education parity targets of MDG 3 (UN, 2013).
Health

In comparison to the rest of the region, Uganda has done well in reducing maternal mortality rates. However, rates remain relatively high, and there has been little reduction in the past decade, with the rate remaining steady at 438 maternal deaths per 100 000 live births in 2013. Uganda has one of the highest rates of unmet need for family planning in the region. Indeed, 34% of women have restricted reproductive autonomy against 20% in Madagascar, Rwanda and Somali, and 15% in Zimbabwe. In addition, women are two times more affected by HIV: the incidence is around 4% for women aged 15-24 years old compared to 2% for men.

Economic participation

Little progress has been achieved across key economic indicators. Although 76% of women are active in the labour force (compared to 79% of men in 2012), they are concentrated in the agricultural sector (76% of female employment, compared to 65% of male employment), characterised by low skill levels and low wages and in vulnerable jobs (92% of female employment, compared to 77% of male employment): for example, 35% of women work as unpaid family workers (UBOS and ICF International Inc., 2012).

An overview of the global SIGI results for sub-Saharan Africa

More than half of the countries in sub-Saharan Africa show high to very high levels of discrimination in social institutions in the 2014 edition of the SIGI (Figure 1). The highest gender inequalities can be found in the sub-indices of restricted resources and assets and restricted physical integrity. There is also a high level of discrimination in the family code sub-index, as it continues to restrict women’s choices and infringe on their socio-economic rights.

Figure 1. The 2014 SIGI results: Uganda, top and lowest performances in sub-Saharan Africa

Note: SSA: sub-Saharan Africa. The sub-index ranges from 0 for no discrimination to 1 for very high levels of discrimination.


The 2014 SIGI results show that social institutions are less discriminatory in Uganda (0.216) than in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA; 0.284) (The sub-index ranges from 0 for no
discrimination to 1 for very high levels of discrimination). The strong performance of Uganda in comparison to the African continent is mainly explained by greater protection of women’s civil liberties. Uganda exhibits levels of discrimination close to the SSA average in respect to women’s rights within the family, access to resources as well as restrictions on their physical integrity. However, the son preference is more widespread in Uganda than in other SSA countries. Nonetheless, Uganda is still far from achieving the low levels of gender-based discrimination observed in South Africa, the region’s top performer. In comparison with South African women, Ugandan women face higher levels of discrimination, especially in regards to marriage and inheritance customs, as well as in the protection of their physical integrity.

**Persistent discriminatory social institutions in sub-Saharan Africa**

Accessing land and having control over property remains one of the biggest challenges for women in the region, due in part to the plurality of legal systems that govern many countries. Gambia, Ghana, Sierra Leone, Sudan and Zambia have discriminatory customary laws in this regard, and 38 countries practise discrimination. Women also face barriers to financial services in 16 countries, such as requiring the approval of a male head of household to open a bank account or access credit. In addition, unequal inheritance practices place limitations on women’s access to land ownership. The majority of land is acquired through customary and traditional inheritance, which favours men. This limits women’s economic and decision-making power at the household and community levels.

The Goma Declaration on Eradicating Sexual Violence and Ending Impunity in the Great Lakes Region (2008) was a positive step towards strengthening the policy framework at the national and regional level for combating violence against women. However, violence remains an issue in the region, with an average of 46% of women having been the victim of gender-based violence in their lifetime (OECD, 2014a). This is connected to the prevalence in the region of social norms and attitudes which justify violence against women. Acceptance of domestic violence is high at the regional level, with 54% of women believing that their husband or partner is justified in hitting or beating them in certain situations (OECD, 2014a). Female genital mutilation (FGM) remains an issue in the region with rates as high as 95% in Somalia (OECD, 2014a). Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda have few to no reported cases of FGM.

Customary laws that condone early marriage and unequal inheritance practices infringe on women’s and girls’ rights. Despite a decline in early marriage rates (e.g. Cameroon, Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania and Zambia), prevalence remains high, with 25% of women aged 15-19 married in the region. There are also expectations on women’s domestic roles, which result in four times as many women performing unpaid care work than men.

**Uganda within east Africa**

The intensity of discriminatory social institutions in Uganda is in line with other east African countries such as Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi and Tanzania (Figure 2). The global 2014 SIGI scores demonstrate lower levels of discrimination in Uganda than in Somalia and Zambia: social institutions discriminate twice as less against Ugandan women than Somali ones. However, Burundi, Madagascar, Mozambique, Rwanda and Zimbabwe perform significantly better than Uganda: levels of discrimination against women in Uganda are two times higher than in Madagascar.
The nature of discrimination differs among countries. According to the 2014 SIGI results, son bias is more an issue of concern in Kenya and Uganda than in the rest of the region. Similarly, women face greater restrictions and discrimination within the family and in the economic sphere in Uganda than in the rest of eastern and sub-Saharan Africa. However, women’s civil liberties and rights are better protected in Uganda than in the region on average thanks to a large share of female members of parliament in eastern Africa.

The Uganda-SIGI

The Uganda-SIGI is a tailor-made policy and research tool, adapting the methodology and conceptual framework of the global Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) to the national context.

Like the global SIGI, the Uganda-SIGI is a composite index comprised of five sub-indices that measure discrimination against women: discriminatory family code, restricted physical integrity, son preference, restricted resources and assets, and restricted civil liberties. The scores of the global SIGI for Uganda and the Uganda-SIGI are not comparable due to differences in the level of analysis, the adaptation of the SIGI framework to the Ugandan context and the use of individual data.

There are three notable differences between the two SIGI indices:

- First, while the global SIGI is a cross-country measure, the Uganda-SIGI compares and looks at discriminatory social institutions at the sub-national level, across Uganda’s five regions and ten sub-regions.
- Second, the definition of discriminatory social institutions was enlarged to include Uganda-specific social institutions identified through extensive national consultations. Hence, the set of variables included in the Uganda-SIGI differs from the global SIGI framework to fit the Ugandan context.
- Finally, the Uganda-SIGI is based on nationally representative household and individual surveys.
What are discriminatory social institutions?

Discriminatory social institutions are formal and informal laws, social norms and practices that restrict women’s rights, access to empowerment opportunities and resources.

Approach

The Uganda-SIGI was carried out in partnership between the OECD Development Centre and the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS). Over a two-year period (May 2013-May 2015), the OECD Development Centre and the Uganda Bureau of Statistics carried out consultations, workshops, in-depth research and surveys. The key milestones in this process include:

- **National consultations:** A series of national workshops and consultations were held in the early phases of the project bringing together government officials and policy makers, researchers, civil society organisations and other experts to discuss and design a SIGI framework that corresponded to the national specificities of Uganda. These national consultations identified the dimensions and variables to be adapted and included within the Uganda-SIGI framework.

- **Commissioned background paper:** A background paper was prepared by two leading gender experts (Rosemarie Nalwadda, Uganda and Debbie Budlender, South Africa). The paper provided a detailed overview of existing indicators on discriminatory social institutions in Uganda and proposals of discriminatory social institutions which should be included in the index.

- **National Technical Advisory Group:** Chaired by UBOS, the Technical Advisory Group provided regular input, feedback and guidance during all stages of the implementation of the Uganda-SIGI. Members of the Technical Advisory Group include independent gender experts and representatives of the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development; the School of Women and Gender Studies in Makerere University Kampala; the UNDP and non-governmental organisations, such as CARE Uganda and Raising Voices.

- **Focus group discussions:** Focus groups in 28 enumeration areas randomly selected from the Uganda-SIGI sample, targeting stakeholders involved in the mobilisation of communities and those facilitating processes of women’s interventions at the community level, were conducted to verify the pertinence of the Uganda-SIGI questionnaire. Qualitative highlights from the focus group included in this report complement the survey’s data findings (see Annex B for more details).

- **Uganda-SIGI questionnaire:** A single survey included two modules (household and individual) and was conducted across Uganda over a three-month period between June and August 2014 (see Annex A for more details).

The conceptual framework of the composite index

As a composite index, the Uganda-SIGI scores sub-regions of Uganda on 20 indicators. These indicators combine detailed information on cultural and traditional practices as well as social norms and attitudes that discriminate against women. The
indicators are grouped into five sub-indices that measure one dimension of social institutions related to gender inequality (Figure 3):

- **Discriminatory family code**: captures restrictions on women’s decision-making power and status in the family
- **Restricted physical integrity**: captures restrictions on women’s control over their bodies
- **Son preference**: captures intra-household bias towards sons and devaluation of daughters
- **Restricted resources and assets**: captures restrictions on women’s access to, control of and entitlement over resources
- **Restricted civil liberties**: captures restrictions on women’s access to, participation and voice in the public and social spheres.

Figure 3. The composition of the Ugandan Social Institutions and Gender Index

Notes

1. [www.mglsd.go.ug/blog/international-women%E2%80%99s-day-celebrations-at-kabale-district-a-synopsis.html](http://www.mglsd.go.ug/blog/international-women%E2%80%99s-day-celebrations-at-kabale-district-a-synopsis.html).
4. For more information refer to Branisa et al. (2013) and OECD (2014b).
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### Region

- **Kampala**
  - Kalangala, Masaka, Mpigi, Rakai, Sembabule, Wakiso, Lyantonde, Bukomansimbi, Butambale, Gomba, Kalungu and Lwengo

- **Central**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

- **Central 1**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

- **Central 2**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

- **East Central**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

- **Mid-Eastern**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

- **Eastern**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

- **Northern**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

- **Western**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

### Districts

- **Kampala**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

- **Central**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

- **Central 1**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

- **Central 2**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

- **East Central**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

- **Mid-Eastern**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

- **Eastern**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

- **Northern**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

- **Western**
  - Kampala City Council Authority
  - Kampala City Council Authority

### Map of Uganda
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- **West Nile**
  - Apac, Gulu, Kitgum, Lira, Pader, Amolatar, Amuru, Dokolo, Ogadu, Agago, Abatong, Kole, Lamwo, Nwoya and Otuke

- **Mid-Northern**
  - Kotido, Moroto, Nakapiripirit, Abim, Kaabong, Amudat and Napak

- **Karamoja**
  - Bundibugyo, Busugula, Hoima, Kabalore, Kasese, Mbarara, Ntungamo, Rukungiri, Rukungiri, Karungi, Ibanda, Isingiro, Kiruhura, Buhweju, Mityana, Rubirizi and Sheema
The construction of the Uganda-SIGI and its sub-indices

The Uganda Social Institutions and Gender Index (Uganda-SIGI) measures discriminatory social institutions that restrict women’s access to justice, resources and empowerment opportunities in Uganda. The Uganda-SIGI is based on comprehensive qualitative and quantitative information on informal laws, social norms and practices that discriminate against women and girls during their life cycle.

While the conceptual framework has been customised to fit with the Ugandan-specific context, the methodological framework is similar to the one used to construct the overall SIGI. This section explains how the sub-indices are built and aggregated to compute the Uganda-SIGI.

### Selection of variables

The Uganda-SIGI variables were selected based on the following criteria, based on the conceptual framework:

- **Conceptual relevance**: The variable should be closely related to the conceptual framework of discriminatory social institutions and measure what it is intended to capture. The variable should identify factors of discrimination that are characteristic of the country and address contextual issues.

- **Underlying factor of gender inequality**: The variable should capture an underlying factor that leads to unequal outcomes for women and men.

- **Data quality, reliability and coverage**: The variable should be based on high-quality, reliable data. Availability of existing data for all sub-regions was assessed and data gaps were identified in preparation of the survey.

- **Distinction**: Each variable should measure a distinct discriminatory institution and should add new information not measured by other variables.

- **Statistical association**: Variables included in the same sub-index should be statistically associated, and thereby capture similar dimensions of social institutions without being redundant.

### Step 1: Data collection

The data used to construct the Uganda-SIGI and its sub-indices come from two main sources. The datasets combine sex-disaggregated data on female and male opportunities and outcomes, as well as attitudinal data. The Uganda-SIGI is built using only data that fit with the conceptual framework developed in the Uganda-SIGI background paper and approved by the Uganda-SIGI steering committee. After defining the data gaps, the 2014 Uganda-SIGI Survey was conducted to complete data from the 2011 Uganda Demographic and Health Survey (DHS).
The 2014 Uganda-SIGI Survey: The Uganda-SIGI index and its sub-indices are mainly built using the SIGI Survey conducted by the Ugandan Bureau of Statistics (UBOS). This survey aimed to close the data gaps regarding quantitative information on discriminatory social institutions. After testing the survey through focus group discussions which provided qualitative insights, both individual and household questionnaires were designed and used to collect quantitative information.

The 2011 Uganda DHS: Some key data on gender-based discrimination in social institutions had already been collected in the last DHS conducted in 2011 in Uganda by the UBOS.

The Uganda-SIGI Survey was designed and carried out by UBOS in order to define a methodology similar to that of the DHS allowing data from the two sources to be fully comparable. Therefore, the same sampling procedure and stratums were used for the Uganda-SIGI Survey.

Step 2: Construction of the sub-indices

The Uganda-SIGI is a composite indicator measuring discriminatory social institutions using 64 variables (see Annex B for a complete list of the variables and indicators used to construct the Uganda-SIGI and its 5 sub-indices). These 64 single variables are grouped into 20 indicators aggregated to construct the 5 sub-indices that capture specific manifestation of such discriminatory norms and practices. Hence, before aggregating the five sub-indices to compute the Uganda-SIGI, variables are aggregated into indicators to construct each Uganda-SIGI sub-index.

Why is the 0-1 coding used?

The variables, sub-indices and composite indicator are scaled between 0 and 1 for easy interpretation. The best possible performance, i.e. lowest level of inequality, is assigned the value 0, and the worst possible performance, i.e. highest level of inequality, the value 1. Hence, a value of zero can be considered the goal, and the distance from zero indicates the extent of gender discrimination.

Generating variables

The Uganda-SIGI and its sub-indices range from 0 for low discrimination to 1 for very high discrimination. Hence, the 64 raw variables used are generated in order to fit the 0-1 scale. When looking at attitudinal data, the percentage of respondents who disagree with the statement favourable to gender equality has been computed for some data: while the percentage of respondents who agree with a discriminatory statement has been used for other data. For example, disagreement is measured for the statement “Men make better political leaders than women” and agreement for “Women and men should have the same opportunities to access political leadership”.

The Uganda-SIGI aims to measure the female situation relative to the male one with respect to social institutions. Hence, when possible, the variables refer to the women’s relative treatment, rather than their absolute well-being. Therefore, female-to-male ratios and female shares are favoured. For example, the variable “spousal violence in the last 12 months” aims to capture the gender bias in domestic violence. In order to capture
gender-based discrimination in the potential violence at home, we compare the number of victims of intimate partner violence by gender, using the female-to-male ratio. In the Karamoja sub-region, domestic violence is widespread for both genders: 32% of men and 28% of women have been victims of sexual or physical abuse at home. This implies that women and men are equally threatened by violent spouses. On the contrary, in the Southwest sub-region, women are the principal victims of violence: 28% of them have been affected by such harmful practices against 1% of men. As domestic violence against men is very low in this sub-region, using a ratio rather than an absolute value would highlight such regional disparities in gender-based violence.

Moreover, the Uganda-SIGI aims to provide detailed information on sub-national regional disparities in discriminatory social institutions without being affected by population size or economic discrepancies. As a consequence, the female share is favoured. For example, women’s political participation is measured by the female share of district councillors. This is critical as sub-regions do not have the same number of districts and thus, the same number of seats in the local council.

**Truncating variables at the equality benchmark**

The construction of the database involves truncating the ratios and share at the equality benchmark. As the Uganda-SIGI focuses on discriminatory social institutions that restrict women’s empowerment opportunities, this data truncation assigns the same score to a district that has reached parity between women and men and to one where women have surpassed men. For example, districts with more than 50% of women district councillors obtain a score of 0.5 as a district having closed gender gaps in political representation. Similarly, the sub-region of Karamoja gets a score of 1 in the female-to-male ratio of spousal violence as more married men than women have been victims of intimate partner abuse in the last 12 months.

**Computing indicators**

For some aspects of discriminatory social institutions, several variables are combined to measure the extent of discrimination. For example, the indicator measuring discrimination against women’s inheritance rights is composed of eight single variables (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. <strong>Composition of the indicator measuring discrimination against women’s inheritance</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opinions towards women’s inheritance rights</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Do daughters and sons have the same rights?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Do widows and widowers have the same rights?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-land assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Do daughters and sons have the same rights?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Do widows and widowers have the same rights?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practices regarding women’s inheritance rights</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Do daughters and sons have the same rights?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Do widows and widowers have the same rights?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-land assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Do daughters and sons have the same rights?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Do widows and widowers have the same rights?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The indicators are computed as the average of standardised variables.
Why use standardised variables?

Variables are normalised to render them comparable and avoid “adding up apples and oranges”. Standardisation converts variables to a common scale with a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1. Hence relative discrimination between regions is measured in the same way by all variables. Moreover, this process ensures integration of the same relative impact on the indicators for each variable.

Standardisation is done by subtracting the mean and then dividing by the standard deviation.

Measuring association between indicators

Each sub-index combines indicators that are assumed to belong to one dimension of discrimination in social institutions. The statistical association between the indicators is tested using the Pearson correlation coefficient and the Cronbach alpha coefficient. These tests assess the correlation between the indicators combined in each sub-index. High and significant correlation between indicators ensures a successful and meaningful aggregation scheme.

Table 2. Cronbach alpha coefficient by sub-indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Index</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discriminatory family code</td>
<td>0.8270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted physical integrity</td>
<td>0.7638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son preference</td>
<td>0.6738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted resources and assets</td>
<td>0.8563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted civil liberties</td>
<td>0.6625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculations.

This process allows the selection of indicators used to construct the Uganda-SIGI sub-indices. Potential candidates were defined following the conceptual framework of the Uganda-SIGI. Indicators selected are those being significantly correlated with other indicators assumed to measure the same phenomena. Then, the framework is retained only if the Cronbach alpha coefficient is higher than 0.65. For example, while the conceptual framework defined parental authority as a critical aspect of discriminatory family code to be taken into account, the statistical tests have given different conclusions (Table 2 presents the Cronbach alpha coefficients; Table 18 in Annex B presents Pearson’s correlation coefficient). Since this indicator was not significantly correlated with other indicators measuring discriminatory opinions and practices within the family, it was not included to compute the discriminatory family code sub-index.
Testing statistical association between indicators

Pearson’s correlation coefficient is a measure of the strength of the association between two indicators. It ranges from -1 to +1, with -1 indicating perfect negative correlation, +1 perfect positive correlation and 0 no correlation. Indicators were chosen only if they showed a positive and significant correlation.

Pearson’s correlation coefficient is calculated as follows:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{\sum(x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sigma_x \sigma_y}$$

With $\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \sigma_x, \sigma_y$ being the means and standard deviations of indicators $x$ and $y$, respectively.

The Cronbach alpha coefficient measures association between variables. It captures how well a set of indicators describes a single dimension. When indicators are not correlated, Cronbach alpha takes the value of 0, while when they are perfectly correlated Cronbach alpha is equal to 1. For the selection of indicators the threshold of 0.65 has been chosen in line with the body of literature (Nardo et al., 2005).

The Cronbach alpha coefficient is computed as:

$$\alpha = \frac{n}{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{cov}(x_i, x_j)}{\sigma_z^2}\right)$$

Where $n$ is the number of indicators, $z = x_1 + x_2 + \ldots + x_n$ and $\sigma_z^2$ is the variance of $z$.

Constructing the sub-indices

The sub-indices aim to provide a summary measure of each dimension of gender discrimination in social institutions by extracting common information captured by indicators, avoiding redundancy and minimising statistical biases. Constructing a sub-index consists of aggregating the indicators with a reasonable weighting scheme through a principal component analysis (PCA). The first principal component (FPC) is used as a proxy for the common information contained in the indicators: it is the weighted sum of the standardised indicators that captures as much of the variance in the data as possible.

The proportion explained by the FPC is 87% for discriminatory family code, 80% for restricted physical integrity, 80% for son preference, 91% for restricted resources and assets, and 83% for restricted civil liberties. The weight assigned to each variable in these linear combinations is obtained by analysing the correlation structure in the data (Table 3).

Why use polychoric principal component analysis to build sub-indices?

Polychoric PCA has numerous advantages for constructing a sub-index:

- It allows for aggregating continuous and categorical indicators.
- By grouping individual indicators according to their degree of correlation, using endogenous weights, it does not assume a specific underlying structure of the data.
- It summarises the underlying trend and common information captured by raw variables by correcting for statistical bias and redundancy and by preserving the maximum possible proportion of the total variation in the original data set.
Table 3. Principal component analysis weights by sub-indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discriminatory family code</th>
<th>Restricted resources and assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early marriage</td>
<td>Secure access to financial services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance rights</td>
<td>Secure access to non-land assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow abuse</td>
<td>Secure access to land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bride price</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender roles</td>
<td>Restricted civil liberties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restricted physical integrity</strong></td>
<td>Access to politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-based violence</td>
<td>Domicile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive autonomy</td>
<td>Freedom to move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual autonomy</td>
<td>Access to justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage pregnancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Son preference</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculations.

The sub-indices are calculated using the following transformation for the country $x$ after generating fictitious best and worst countries:

$$
\text{Subindex}_x = \frac{\text{FPC}_x - \text{FPC}_{\text{best}}}{\text{FPC}_{\text{worst}} - \text{FPC}_{\text{best}}}
$$

The fictitious best and worst countries respectively correspond to an ideal country with perfect gender equality and a country with very high levels of discrimination in each variable, i.e. the maximum of each variable. The best fictitious country will get a perfect score of 0 in the Uganda-SIGI and each of its sub-indices. It provides a benchmark for the interpretation of the Uganda-SIGI scores.

Step 3: Computing the Uganda-SIGI

Why are the sub-indices equally weighted in the SIGI?

Equal weights for each sub-index offer two benefits:

- Each dimension of discriminatory social institutions has equal value.
- No dimension is more important than another in terms of the deprivation experienced by women.

The Uganda-SIGI is a composite indicator built as an unweighted average of a non-linear function of the sub-indices:

$$
\text{SIGI} = \frac{1}{5} \text{Discriminatory family code}^2 + \frac{1}{5} \text{Restricted physical integrity}^2 \\
+ \frac{1}{5} \text{Son preference}^2 + \frac{1}{5} \text{Restricted resources and assets}^2 \\
+ \frac{1}{5} \text{Restricted civil liberties}^2
$$
Why square each SIGI sub-index?

The quadratic form is inspired by poverty measures:

- The partial compensation means that very high inequality in one dimension can be only partially offset by low inequality in another dimension.
- It makes for a more egalitarian performance in the sub-indices, which is preferable to a more uneven one.

Uganda-SIGI classification

The Uganda-SIGI classification clusters five regions and ten sub-regions of Uganda into five levels of discrimination in social institutions: very low, low, medium, high and very high (Table 4). It is based on the Jenks Natural Breaks Classification. This method of classifying data optimally arranges values into the five levels, or classes. It aims to minimise the average deviation from the class mean, while maximising the deviation from the means of the other classes. Hence, this method reduces the variance within classes and maximises the variance between classes.

Table 4. Uganda-SIGI classification: Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[0;0.2]</td>
<td>[0.2;0.35]</td>
<td>[0.35;0.5]</td>
<td>[0.5; 0.6]</td>
<td>[0.6;1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The sub-index ranges from 0 for no discrimination to 1 for very high levels of discrimination.
Source: Authors’ calculations.

Notes

1. For more information refer to Branisa et al. (2013) and OECD (2014b).
2. For more information, please refer to OECD (2014b).
RESULTS
Uganda-SIGI

Figure 4. Uganda-SIGI score in Uganda sub-regions

Notes: The sub-index ranges from 0 for no discrimination to 1 for very high levels of discrimination. The map shows levels of discrimination through a spectrum ranging from light blue – which represents very low levels of discrimination in social institutions – to dark blue – which represents very high levels of discrimination in social institutions.


The Uganda-SIGI captures and measures gender-based discrimination in social institutions – formal and informal laws, social norms and practices – across ten sub-regions of Uganda. It testifies to the pervasiveness of gender-based discrimination in the Ugandan social institutions and reveals the ongoing prevalence of discrimination. With an average score of 0.470, the Uganda-SIGI exposes the persistence of discriminatory social institutions in Uganda that restrict women’s rights and empowerment opportunities, and explains the challenges in eliminating gender inequalities in key development areas, such as education or employment.

Despite anti-discriminatory constitutional provisions and condemnation of any custom that contradicts human rights (Articles 21(1) and 33(6), Constitution of the Republic of Uganda), discrimination against women in social institutions is high. As highlighted in the Introduction, the government has enacted several new laws to improve the situation of women, but their implementation has been limited by persistent discriminatory social norms and practices. Discrepancies in the implementation of anti-discriminatory laws are an additional explanation of regional disparities in levels of gender-based discrimination in social institutions.
The Uganda-SIGI results highlight that social choices and preferences shaping discrimination and reflecting unequal power relations between women and men vary across regions (Figure 4). The social roles that women and men play, and consequently the level of discrimination against women, significantly varies across sub-regions as gender is shaped by culture, social relations and natural environments. Thus, regional disparities in the Uganda-SIGI score are notably explained by values, norms and customs that evolve differently in different parts of Uganda. Regional variations are often striking: the Uganda-SIGI score of the most unequal sub-region is double that of the most equal (Table 5). This implies that women living in the Mid-Northern sub-region face twice as much deprivation related to discriminatory social institutions as women living in the capital. Indeed, the districts belonging to the sub-regions of Mid-Northern and Southwest display higher levels of discrimination than the Ugandan average, and two times higher than those in the capital. The two regions have similar Uganda-SIGI scores though they differ one from the other: in the Southwest, gender discrimination is particularly strong in terms of access to resources; by contrast, in the Mid-Northern, the main concern is related to physical integrity.

**Regional performances**

The least discriminatory region in the Uganda-SIGI is Kampala, followed by the neighbouring Central and Eastern regions. There are two notable exceptions to this overall trend:

- West Nile (located in the Northern region) ranks better than the national average as women face less discrimination in the civil liberties and access to resources and assets sub-indices.
- East Central displays considerable inequalities and threats to the physical integrity of women.

High levels of discrimination in the Uganda-SIGI are concentrated in the Northern and Western regions. Notable exceptions are:

- in Karamoja, access to assets and resources is most equal and there are lower levels of discrimination against women’s civil liberties
- in the Mid-Western sub-region physical integrity of women is less at risk and less subject to discriminatory practices.
Table 5. Results of the Uganda-SIGI and its sub-indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uganda-SIGI</th>
<th>Discriminatory family code</th>
<th>Restricted physical integrity</th>
<th>Son preference</th>
<th>Restricted resources and assets</th>
<th>Restricted civil liberties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>0.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Eastern</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 2</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamoja</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Northern</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Nile</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Western</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary+</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>0.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No schooling</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The sub-index ranges from 0 for no discrimination to 1 for very high levels of discrimination.

Education and changing gender norms

Rising education levels appear to positively affect levels of discrimination in social institutions. Analysis of the Uganda-SIGI results highlights that there are lower levels of discriminatory attitudes amongst individuals with higher levels of educational achievement (at least a secondary education). There is potential for future improvements given that only one-third of the Ugandan population have been enrolled in secondary education (the gross school enrolment rate in 2013 was 27%; World Bank, n.d.). Improving levels of education may, therefore, further support the positive transformation of discriminatory social institutions and gender inequalities.

Trends across the Uganda-SIGI sub-indices

Discrimination against women pervades across the five sub-indices of the Uganda-SIGI (Figure 5) but is particularly high in the discriminatory family code and restricted civil liberties sub-indices. With an average of 0.706 and 0.783 (Table 5), respectively, these high results prove that an anti-discriminatory legal framework is not enough to effectively tackle discriminatory attitudes and practices within the private and public spheres. Importantly, these two Uganda-SIGI sub-indices are the most homogenous ones across all of the regions of Uganda: restrictions on women’s voice and status in the private and public spheres are widespread discriminations that Ugandan women face daily.
The son preference sub-index plays an integral role in perpetuating discrimination and inequality across generations. Discrimination against the girl child (e.g. unequal resources allocated for her health or education) spills over and affects her empowerment opportunities across her life course. Lower status given to girls compared to boys explains persistent gender inequality in other Uganda-SIGI sub-indices. In the Uganda-SIGI, regional disparities in discrimination against the girl child explain more than 70% of the regional disparities in discrimination against women within the family (Figure 6). In sub-regions where there is a high preference for sons, women also face high discrimination within the family and restrictions on their physical integrity. A family preference for sons over daughters reflects the lower status given to girls, which is reinforced in discriminatory family codes restricting women’s decision-making power and status within the family.

Figure 6. Higher discrimination within the family code, higher son preference

Note: This figure presents the relationship between the level of discrimination in the son preference and the family code dimensions.

Classification of regions in the Uganda-SIGI

The Uganda-SIGI scores five regions and ten sub-regions of Uganda according to their level of discrimination in social institutions. It classifies them into **five categories ranging from very low levels to very high levels of discrimination in social institutions**. This classification groups regions or sub-regions having similar levels of discrimination in the Uganda-SIGI by minimising differences between sub-regional Uganda-SIGI scores in the same class and maximising the differences between classes. The classification is presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Uganda-SIGI classification: Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td></td>
<td>Central</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td></td>
<td>– Central 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td></td>
<td>– Central 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Mid-Eastern</td>
<td></td>
<td>– West Nile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– East Central</td>
<td></td>
<td>– Karamoja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Mid-Northern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Southwest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite efforts made by the government of Uganda to address the legal rights of women, sub-regional disparities in the level of discrimination in social institutions suggest that laws tackling gender-based discrimination are unevenly applied and implemented across the country. Among the ten sub-regions included in the Uganda-SIGI, none of them are classified as having very low levels of discrimination (Figure 7). Kampala displays low levels of gender inequality related to social institutions, while the Central and Eastern regions of Uganda have medium levels of discrimination. The majority of the national population (60%) lives in sub-regions where women face medium levels of discrimination related to social institutions. On the other end of the spectrum, gender inequality in social institutions is a serious concern in the north and the west of the country, with a particular attention to the Southwest and Mid-Northern sub-regions.

Figure 7. Share of Ugandan population by level of discrimination in the Uganda-SIGI

The districts of the Kampala sub-region classified as having low levels of discrimination in the overall Uganda-SIGI aggregated index also have the lowest levels of discrimination in all sub-indices, except the restricted resources and assets sub-index (Figure 8). In the capital, Kampala, women benefit from better protection of their physical integrity and better status within the family as a daughter, wife and widow. The unequal distribution of caring responsibilities between both women and men, and daughters and sons further help to explain this classification.

Sub-regions classified as having high to very high levels of discrimination in social institutions represent 30% of the population. The main difference between these groups is in the protection of women’s physical integrity. Women’s rights to freedom from violence, and their reproductive and sexual health and rights in the poorer performing sub-regions (e.g. Southwest and Mid-Northern) would benefit from improvements in health infrastructure and more comprehensive support systems to address intimate partner violence.

Figure 8. Regional scores in the Uganda-SIGI sub-indices by level of discrimination in the Uganda-SIGI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discriminatory family code</th>
<th>Restricted physical integrity</th>
<th>Son preference</th>
<th>Restricted civil liberties</th>
<th>Restricted resources and assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The sub-index ranges from 0 for no discrimination to 1 for very high levels of discrimination.


Note

1. Uganda is composed by ten sub-regions grouped into five regions.
SUB-INDEX ANALYSIS
**Discriminatory family code**

**What does the discriminatory family code sub-index capture?**

This sub-index captures social institutions that limit women’s decision-making power and undervalue their status in the household and the family. It covers areas such as marriage, parental authority, inheritance, and gender roles in productive and reproductive responsibilities.

These formal and informal laws, social norms and practices co-exist in different types of legal systems, including civil or common law, customary law and religious laws. In some cases, the presence of a legal protection is insufficient to prevent discrimination, which persists in social and cultural practices. For example, under current Ugandan law (Constitution, Children Act and Amendment to the Penal Code; CEDAW, 2010: 22), the minimum legal age of marriage is 18 for women and men. However, despite the constitutional provision against early marriage, the 1973 Customary Marriage Act (Chapter 248) contradicts this constitutional provision by setting the age of consent at 16 years old for women (Article 11a).

**Why is this important for development and for gender equality?**

Women’s decision-making power and status affect both their ability to choose their own development pathways and the well-being of their families in terms of health and education. Hence, discriminatory laws, attitudes and practices within the family not only influence women’s empowerment opportunities and well-being but also the development of their communities, families and children.

In Uganda, discriminatory opinions and practices such as early marriage are associated with lower female education. In regions where favourable opinions towards early marriage are widespread, the number of girls married before the legal age of 18 is higher and the female secondary education lower (Figure 9). This harmful practice justified by discriminatory attitudes has severe development consequences. High prevalence of early marriage is associated with women’s low access to secondary education and higher gender gaps in education and therefore has a negative impact on women’s employment opportunities. Research has shown that marrying young, particularly with large age gaps between spouses, can also lead to high rates of infant mortality and poor maternal health (Bruce and Clark, 2004) and has intergenerational implications for the health and education of the subsequent generation.
Figure 9. Attitudes and prevalence of early marriage, and female secondary education

Notes: The left panel presents the relationship between attitudes towards early marriage and prevalence of girls, controlling for attitudes and prevalence of early marriage of boys. An $R^2 = 0.82$ means that 82% of regional disparities in early marriage prevalence are explained by regional differences in favourable attitudes toward early marriage of girls, attitudes and prevalence of early marriage of boys. The right panel presents the relationship between girls’ secondary education completion rates and girls’ early marriage prevalence, controlling for levels of poverty (share of population in the lowest wealth quintile) and boys’ secondary education completion rates. An $R^2 = 0.57$ means that 57% of regional disparities in female secondary education are explained by regional differences in the prevalence of early marriage of girls, poverty levels and secondary education of boys.


Causes and consequences of early marriage are closely linked and difficult to distinguish. The prevalence of early marriage in Uganda is associated with several factors manifested at the community and the household level. Those factors could be considered as both causes and consequences of such discriminatory practices.

- Low levels of women’s empowerment: Women’s autonomy and independence in decision making is limited by restricted access and control over resources, low education levels and low employment opportunities (Abadian, 1996). Research from Uganda shows that marrying young negatively affects a girl’s education, wage employment opportunities and participation in household decision making (Green et al., 2009).

- Poverty: Extreme poverty means that girls may be considered as an economic burden and a source of wealth through bride price. One parent stated that family poverty “forces parents to marry off their young girls because they are a source of wealth in the form of bride price” (Focus Group Discussion, Wakiso District). On the other hand, marrying young reduces a girl’s opportunities to get out of poverty (Green et al., 2009).

- Early pregnancy: Many girls marry early due to unintended pregnancy. On the other hand, marrying young affects childbearing patterns, increasing the fertility rate and the prevalence of child pregnancies (Green et al., 2009).
How does the Uganda-SIGI measure discriminatory family code?

The sub-index is composed of the following indicators:

- **Early marriage**: Attitudes and practices related to girls’ early marriage
- **Inheritance rights**: Attitudes and practices that discriminate against daughters’ and widows’ inheritance rights over land and non-land assets
- **Widow abuse**: Attitudes and practices that discriminate against widows’ status
- **Bride price**: Attitudes and practices related to bride price
- **Gender roles**: Attitudes and practices related to the distribution of caring responsibilities between wife and husband

How does Uganda perform in the discriminatory family code sub-index?

With a national average score of 0.706, Uganda is quite far from providing equal treatment of women and men within the family (corresponding to a score of 0). Figure 10 presents the regional disparities in levels of discrimination within the family code. Even in the stronger performing sub-regions (West Nile, Mid-Eastern, Central 1 and 2, and Kampala), the sub-index scores show high levels of discrimination against women’s decision-making power and status within the family. In the Karamoja, Mid-Western, Southwest, Mid-Northern and East Central sub-regions, this unequal treatment of women and men within the family is widespread and reinforced by discriminatory attitudes and opinions toward female gender roles in the private sphere.

Figure 10. Discriminatory family code scores in Ugandan sub-regions

Note: The sub-index ranges from 0 for no discrimination to 1 for very high levels of discrimination.

**Disparities between the top and the lowest performer are substantial:** Women’s rights and duties within the family are 1.5 times more restricted in the districts belonging to the Karamoja sub-region than in the capital. This is mainly explained by regional differences related to marriage customs and practices. In Karamoja, women face high levels of discrimination regarding marriage customs: over 50% of them were in union before turning 18 against 12% of men. Early marriage is widely accepted, but only for girls: 72% of respondents declare that girls should be married by 18, while 75% believe than men should be married later. This unequal treatment of women and men over marriage attests to the particular importance of embedded social expectation on gender roles. This is reflected in the social acceptance of the unequal distribution of caring responsibilities between women and men. Even if both women and men are working outside the home, discriminatory attitudes prevent men from performing caring and reproductive functions. In addition, bride price is reported to be a common practice by 95% of the Karamoja population, which is widely accepted (98%) because it gives a girl status (91%).

With a score of 0.570, Kampala is the strongest performer for this sub-index, even if it is far from providing equal treatment of women and men within the family. This performance is mainly due to low prevalence and acceptance of early marriage: one-third of women living in Kampala were married before turning 18, but the majority (50%) were in a union after 20 (median age at first union), which was set as the minimum age of marriage by the majority of the respondents. Interestingly, the median age of first marriage increases across age cohorts, suggesting that women are getting married later and, therefore, that early marriage prevalence is in decline in Kampala. In addition to promoting equal inheritance rights, this trend may imply convergence to gender equality within the private sphere in Kampala.

Kampala is also characterised by generally more positive opinions on gender equality in respect to family rights and duties:

- three-quarters of respondents agree that daughters and sons, as well as widows and widowers, should have the same rights to inherit land and non-land assets
- three-quarters of respondents declare that caring responsibilities should be equally distributed between the husband and wife when both work outside the home.

**Regional disparities in the manifestation of discriminatory family code**

Figure 11 presents the regional disparities in indicators used to measure levels of discrimination in the family code. In Uganda, the levels of discrimination against women regarding marriage customs, inheritance rights and widow treatment parallel the distribution of traditional gender roles. However, this national interpretation hides large regional disparities. Inheritance rights and widow treatment are the main form of gender-based discrimination in the family in the Southwest sub-region; while the lower status given to women within the family sphere mainly manifests in terms of unequal distribution of housework in the Western and East Central sub-regions.
Highlight from the focus group discussion

The focus group discussion reported that boys normally get married at 18 and above because they are considered mature at that age, are able to work to pay the bride price and also support their families. It was further reported that boys delay marriage because they fear responsibility of providing for the family. Contrary to girls, they are perceived to be more involved in the decision making over their own marriage.

Favourable opinions towards early marriage

Although the Ugandan Constitution guarantees equality, marriage customs discriminate against women: early marriage is more widespread for women than men (53% and 10% respectively) and more accepted (45% and 15%, respectively). Marrying young is more likely to occur in the Mid-Northern and East Central sub-regions – where girls’ child marriage affected two out of three women – than in the Kampala and Southwest sub-regions. The persistence of the practice is notably explained by the persistence of favourable opinions towards early marriage in these sub-regions. In the Mid-Northern sub-region, half of the population set the minimum age of marriage for girls before 18. This figure climbs up to 72% for Karamoja (Table 7).

Women’s dependent status within the household

Marriage customs and social expectations regarding the division of labour within the family still confer upon women the status of a dependent, restricting their empowerment opportunities. Bride price is considered as a common (78%) and required practice (92%) that gives a status to a girl (93%) and provides ownership to the husband (72%). This is particularly true in Karamoja (96%, 98%, 91% and 91%). Even in Kampala, such discriminatory opinions persist: more than half of the population declares that if a man pays a bride price for his wife she becomes his property.
Highlights from the focus group discussion

The focus group discussion reported that some families are forced to marry their daughters due to poverty. Bride price is seen as a source of wealth to the family of the girl. “These days people pay more than 20 cows, 12 goats and millions of money which was not the case in the past, making it a business to raise wealth for the family of the girl” voiced a man in Adjumani. It was noted that in Adjumani district the issue of bride price is taken seriously, even in the case of the death of the bride and groom: if the woman dies a man has to pay the bride price and if a man dies before paying the bride price, his relatives have to pay it.

This unequal status of women within marriage is reflected in opinions towards gender roles: one-third of Ugandans believe that caring responsibilities should not be shared equally within the household. This traditional conception of gender roles is widespread in the Mid-Western (48%), East Central (38%), Karamoja (34%), Mid-Northern (33%) and Southwest (33%) sub-regions where more than one in three respondents disagrees with equal sharing of unpaid care activities among working couples.

Restricted women’s rights after the death of the male household head

Women’s inheritance rights and widow status are particularly vulnerable in Uganda, due to widespread discriminatory opinions and practices. Close to half of the population (44%) reject a widow’s right to remarry outside of her former husband’s clan: 51% attest to this occurring in practice. This is seen as justifying grabbing of widows’ property (82%). Widow abuse is even more concentrated in some sub-regions. However, manifestations of such harmful treatment differ: levirate marriages (see the Glossary) are common in the Karamoja (80%) and Mid-Northern sub-regions (68%) and less frequent in the Central region (15% in Kampala and Central 2 sub-regions); restrictions on widows’ right to remarry and to keep the inheritance are common in the Western region.

In addition, these discriminatory views are found also on the rights of widows and daughters to inherit. Almost one-third of Ugandans believe that women and men should not enjoy equal rights to inherit land and non-land assets, and furthermore, half declare this is standard practice. Restrictions appear to be particularly stark for land assets: one in three respondents declares that a daughter’s inheritance rights over land are not respected in Uganda, 78% in Karamoja. Those discriminatory opinions and practices are particularly significant in rural districts.
Table 7. Selected discriminatory family code variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls’ early marriage</th>
<th>Bride price</th>
<th>Gender roles</th>
<th>Widows’ inheritance right over land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 2</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Eastern</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamoja</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Northern</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Nile</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Western</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Annex B for a detailed definition of the variables.


Notes

1. Early marriage is defined as marriage under 18 years old.
2. Uganda Legal Information Institute (n.d.).
Restricted physical integrity

What does the restricted physical integrity sub-index measure?

This sub-index captures social institutions that limit women’s control over their bodies, increase their vulnerability and normalise attitudes toward gender-based violence. It includes the potential violence experienced in the household and in society, as well as restrictions on women’s sexual and reproductive health and rights.

This includes formal and informal laws, norms and practices that fail to protect women’s physical and reproductive integrity and that allow gender-based violence. In some cases, legal protection can be insufficient to prevent discrimination, due to poor implementation and awareness of these laws. For example, rape is a criminal offence in Uganda under Chapter 14 of the Penal Code, which also prescribes the death penalty for those convicted. However, spousal rape is not currently recognised as a criminal offence, undermining women’s sexual autonomy, i.e. their right to refuse sex to her husband. Moreover, the law is not effectively enforced: rape is underreported, and police lack the resources and capacity to investigate cases of rape (US Department of State, 2013: 24-25).

Why is this important for development and for gender equality?

Restricted physical integrity due to gender-based violence and a lack of reproductive autonomy has serious impacts on the health outcomes of women and their children, and is linked to increasing women’s vulnerability to poverty.

Figure 12. More opinions justifying spousal violence against women, higher prevalence

Notes: This figure presents the relationship between the number of women victims of spousal (physical or sexual) violence in the last 12 months and attitudes justifying violence against women after controlling for prevalence of spousal violence against men. An $R^2 = 0.61$ means that 61% of regional disparities in prevalence of spousal violence against women are explained by regional differences in attitudes justifying domestic violence against women and prevalence of spousal violence against men.

Violence against women is acknowledged as a violation of basic human rights, with severe negative development outcomes. There are high direct and indirect costs associated with violence against women, with adverse impacts on women’s well-being as well as that of their households, communities and public budgets (ICRW, 2009). There are also related costs for employers in terms of lost wages and productivity, and for the public sector in terms of health, police, legal and related expenditures. In Uganda, a woman loses an average of at least 11 paid work days a year due to incidents of intimate partner violence and has expenditure related to each incident of intimate partner violence, with the highest outlay for seeking police intervention (Table 8). The annual cost for hospital care of female victims treated for intimate partner violence-related injuries is USD 1.2 million and local councils report a total of USD 1.3 million in annual expenses (ICRW, 2009).

Table 8. **Average out-of-pocket cost of one-time service use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USD</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Local traditional authority</th>
<th>Social services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although, Uganda recently rolled out innovative programmes coupled with strong legislative initiatives to address intimate partner violence, its prevalence is still high. However, these costs could be reduced by addressing attitudes that justify and accept domestic violence attitudes towards domestic violence. Indeed, **more opinions justifying and condoning domestic violence are related to higher prevalence rates** (Figure 12).

**How does the Uganda-SIGI measure restricted physical integrity?**

The sub-index is composed of the following indicators:

- Gender-based violence
- Prevalence, attitudes and stigma of spousal violence
- Reproductive autonomy
- Attitudes towards reproductive autonomy
- Sexual autonomy
- Attitudes towards women’s sexual autonomy
- Teenage pregnancy
- Prevalence of teenage pregnancy
How does Uganda perform in the restricted physical integrity sub-index?

With an average of 0.589, indicating high levels of discrimination, women’s rights to freedom from violence, reproductive and sexual autonomy are poorly protected in Uganda (a score of 0 means perfect gender equality). The regional differences highlighted in Figure 13 indicate that laws tackling gender-based violence and guaranteeing women’s sexual and reproductive rights are unevenly applied and implemented across the country. These violations of women’s control over their bodies are particularly widespread and accepted in the Mid-Northern sub-region, while the regions of Central 1 and 2 and Kampala are more successful in protecting women’s physical and reproductive integrity.

Figure 13. Restricted physical integrity scores in Ugandan sub-regions

Note: The sub-index ranges from 0 for no discrimination to 1 for very high levels of discrimination.

This is evident in the significant disparities between the top and poorest performers: while Kampala scores 0.390, the Mid-Northern sub-region scores 0.918, which is 50% higher than the Uganda average. Those figures suggest that the levels of restrictions on women’s physical integrity are double in Mid-Northern sub-region compared to the capital. This is mainly due to differences in gender-based violence. The prevalence rate of spousal violence against women is double in Mid-Northern compared to Kampala: almost half of the women living in Mid-Northern have been a victim of intimate partner violence in the last 12 months, two-thirds in their lifetime, compared to one-quarter of women in the capital. In contrast, only 6% of men in Mid-Northern report being victims of intimate partner violence in the last 12 months. The gender gaps in domestic violence are stark in Mid-Northern: a woman is eight times more likely to be victim of spousal violence than a man.

Women’s sexual and reproductive health and rights are also highly limited by discriminatory opinions in Mid-Northern: two-thirds of residents declared that a woman is neither justified in refusing sex with her husband nor in taking decisions about contraception. In contrast, only one-fifth of the Kampala population shares such discriminatory attitudes towards women’s sexual and reproductive health and rights. In addition to economic regional disparities, these regional differences in attitudes are mirrored in practices: 43% of women in Mid-Northern have unmet needs for family planning compared to 17% of women in Kampala.
Regional disparities in the manifestation of restricted physical liberties

Figure 14 shows the regional disparities across the indicators used to measure restrictions on women’s physical integrity. Interestingly, on average in Uganda, the level of discrimination against women’s decision making over their bodies in terms of reproductive health parallels results for violence against women. Conversely, in each sub-region those restrictions appear in various ways and extents, except in the Southwest. The prevalence of adolescent pregnancies is a major concern in the Karamoja, Kampala and Mid-Eastern sub-regions but not in West Nile, where restrictions on women’s sexual autonomy mainly explain women’s deprivation.

Persistence of violence against women

In Uganda, weak implementation of laws and policies addressing violence against women appear to influence prevalence rates: there are high levels of acceptance and prevalence of gender-based violence, with women the principal victims. Indeed, women experienced twice as much spousal violence than married men in their lifetime, and more than one in three women was a victim in the last 12 months. The most serious cases of domestic violence against women are reported to occur in the East Central and Mid-Northern sub-regions, where spousal violence affects more than 60% of married women in their lifetime. Gender disparities in violence are also related to the perpetrators of violence: intimate partner violence is the most common form of violence against women (83%) while persons committing physical violence against married persons are usually not their spouse (Table 9).

Highlights from the focus group discussion

The focus group discussion reported that men tend to run away from their responsibilities due to excessive alcohol use and high levels of household poverty; this situation causes women emotional and psychological suffering and often leads to physical violence: a woman from Isingiro said, “When we ask our husbands for basic needs, they turn out to be violent if they do not have the money for these.”
Social norms justifying violence against women help explain such high prevalence rates amongst women: there appears to be a correspondence between attitudes and practices (Figure 12). More than half of Ugandans agree that domestic violence against women is justified under certain circumstances, such as if a wife burns food, argues with her husband, goes out without telling him, neglects the children or refuses to have sex with him. This percentage climbs to over two-thirds of the population in the West Nile and Mid-Eastern sub-regions.

Moreover, such high levels may also explain the low number of women seeking justice and reporting domestic violence: in Uganda 42% of women who have experienced physical or sexual violence have sought help to stop the intimate partner violence. This confirms previous findings indicating that court officials and police are biased in handling complaints made by women against their husbands (UNFPA and AIDOS, 2003). Intimate partner violence is ignored as a crime by traditional authorities, and government officials, including the police, press women to return to their violent spouses (ICRW, 2009).

**Restrictions on women’s sexual and reproductive health and rights**

Persistent discriminatory attitudes still reduce women’s right to sexual and reproductive health providing women the ability to enjoy a mutually satisfying and safe relationship free from coercion or violence. In Uganda about one in three people think that a woman cannot be justified in refusing to have sex with her husband and cannot decide whether to use contraception. Opinions towards women’s sexual autonomy are less discriminatory in Kampala (22%) and in both Central 1 and Central 2 (24%), but much more restrictive in the Karamoja (42%), Southwest (58%) and Mid-Northern (63%) sub-regions.

**Highlights from the focus group discussion**

There was awareness in the focus group discussions about family planning among women and men across all sites (traditional methods included use of safe days, breast feeding and abstinence; scientific methods included IUDs, pills, tubal ligation, implants, Norplant, coils, condoms and vasectomy).

However, it was noted that in most cases it was the women who wanted to use birth control for a manageable family. Women reported that men generally care less about family planning and are not worried about the number of children, regardless of whether they can take care of them or not. There are very few instances were men reported using condoms.

Moreover, the injector plan was the most common practiced method across all sites, notably because it is not easily noticed by husbands. It was further observed that although pills are easy to access, they can easily be discovered by their husbands.

Women’s reproductive rights are better respected in Mid-Eastern, Kampala and East Central, where more than 80% of the population agrees that women should have the right to take decisions over contraception. In addition to regional disparities in terms of health infrastructure and access to information, discrepancies in attitudes towards women’s reproductive autonomy could explain why one in three women in Uganda declares having an unmet need for family planning. Restrictions are larger in Mid-Northern and West Nile (more than 40%) and lowest in Kampala (17%).
Table 9. Selected restricted physical integrity variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender-based violence</th>
<th>Reproductive autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spousal violence (last 12 months)</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 2</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Eastern</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamoja</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Northern</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Nile</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Western</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Annex B for a detailed definition of the variables.


Notes

2. Direct costs of intimate partner violence correspond to women’s and their households’ out-of-pocket expenditures for services following an incident, and the cost to providers of providing these services. Indirect costs refer to economic impacts of intimate partner violence likely to manifest through lower productivity and absenteeism from work.
3. Based on a nationally representative sample (ICRW, 2009).
Son preference

What does the son preference sub-index capture?

This sub-index captures unequal intra-household investments in care, education and resources allocated to daughters and sons reflecting the lower value given to girls. Son preference can also be manifested in parents’ preferences for having sons over daughters and in different burdens of unpaid care work between male and female siblings.

Formal and informal laws, social norms and practices can lead to unequal treatment of daughters and sons. This is linked to the economic under-valuation of women and girls, where daughters are viewed as an economic burden and sons as a source of lifelong economic support. In addition to the economic rationale underpinning son preference, there is also a connected cultural explanation tied to the social prestige associated with sons.

Why is this important for development and gender equality?

Son preference can have a range of negative implications for development outcomes. Firstly, practices such as female infanticide or sex-selective abortions increase the sex ratio of boys to girls. Skewed sex ratios will have serious social consequences among men unable to find female partners, which could lead to sexual violence and increased trafficking of girls (UNFPA, 2007). Secondly, families’ under-investment in girls’ health, nutrition and education has a negative impact on development outcomes, including higher mortality, worse health status or lower educational attainment among girls. Finally, the division of unpaid domestic work also has an impact on girls’ education, health, and subsequent employment and income-generating opportunities (Jones et al., 2010).

In Uganda, such preferences for boys in the allocation of educational resources and in responsibilities for housework are associated with higher gender gaps in education. In regions where preferences for boys’ education over that of girls are higher, the number of women without formal schooling compared to men is higher (Figure 15, left panel) given the level of poverty. In regions where girls are more likely than boys to spend a greater number of hours in unpaid domestic work in the household, their primary education completion rates compared to those of boys are negatively impacted (Figure 15, right panel) given the level of poverty. This confirms previous findings from other country studies showing that gender disparities in domestic chores have a considerable impact on the time girls have available to undertake other activities, such as school: girls devoting 28 hours a week to housework attend school 25% less than girls spending half that time (ILO, 2009).
Figure 15. Higher preference for son, higher gender gaps in education

![Graph showing the relationship between son preference and gender gaps in education](image)

**Notes:** The left panel presents the relationship between son preference in the allocation of educational resources and gender gaps in the number of individuals with no formal education, controlling for levels of poverty (lowest wealth quintile). A female-to-male ratio of “no formal education” equal to 2 means that twice as many women as men have no formal education. An $R^2 = 0.92$ means that 92% of regional disparities in educational gender gaps are explained by regional differences in son preference in the allocation of educational resources and poverty. The right panel presents the relationship between son preference in unpaid care work and gender gaps in primary education completion rates, controlling for levels of poverty. A male-to-female ratio of primary education equal to 1.2 means that 120 boys have completed their primary education for 100 girls. An $R^2 = 0.85$ means that 85% of regional disparities in educational gender gaps are explained by regional differences in son preference in the allocation of caring responsibilities.


The different opportunity costs of investing in the education of girls and boys may explain gender disparities in caring responsibilities and son preference. Indeed, sending children to school results in a loss of labour for a household. On average around the world, since girls perform more housework than boys, the opportunity cost of sending them to school is higher and households often lose more by sending girls to school (Ritchie et al., 2004).

**How does the Uganda-SIGI measure son preference?**

The sub-index is composed of the following indicators:

- **Caring responsibilities**: Attitudes and practices related to the distribution of caring responsibilities between sons and daughters
- **Son bias in education**: Attitudes and practices that discriminate against daughters in terms of education
- **Son bias in health**: Attitudes that discriminate against daughters in terms of healthcare
How does Uganda perform in the son preference sub-index?

With an average score of 0.654, girls and boys in Uganda do not enjoy equal treatment and value (corresponding to a score of 0). The levels of son preference throughout the country are heterogeneous (Figure 16). Sub-regions and districts closer to the capital display lower levels of discrimination against girls: along with the country’s capital, the Central and Eastern regions tend to have lower levels of discrimination than the Ugandan average, while at the other end of the spectrum the Northern and Western regions tend to discriminate more against girls.

Figure 16. Son preference scores in Ugandan sub-regions

Note: The sub-index ranges from 0 for no discrimination to 1 for very high levels of discrimination.

Disparities between the top and the lowest performers are significant: Southwest’s score is double that of Kampala, suggesting levels of discrimination in the son preference dimension two times higher than in the capital. Kampala ranks relatively well thanks to lower levels of discrimination in the distribution of caring responsibilities between daughters and sons, and lower son preference regarding both health and education. The strong performance of Kampala compared to the Southwest sub-region is mainly explained by the absence of son preference in terms of distribution of unpaid care work. Almost all the respondents living in Kampala agreed that girls and boys should receive equal allocation of household resources for education and health. Additionally, three-quarters of respondents agreed with girls and boys equally sharing housework. However, there is a contradiction with actual practices: 60% of individuals report that in fact girls spend more time on domestic work than boys.

The Southwest sub-region is the poorest performing sub-region for son preference. This rank is mainly driven by persistent unfavourable opinions towards equal allocation of resources to sons and daughters. In this sub-region, discriminatory opinions against girls are more widespread than in other regions in Uganda. For example, 10% of people believe that more resources should be invested in the healthcare of boys than in that of girls; this is three times higher than the Ugandan average. Regarding education, 13% of people think that more resources should be invested in the education and care of boys compared to a national average of 9%; and one out of five individuals questioned in the Southwest sub-region believes that higher education is more important for boys than for girls.
Regional disparities in the manifestation of son preference

Figure 17 presents the regional disparities in indicators used to measure the level of discrimination in the son preference sub-index. In Uganda, the levels of discrimination against girls related to son preference in the allocation of resources parallel the distribution of caring responsibilities favouring boys. However, this national interpretation hides large regional disparities. Son preference in health is more prolific in the Southwest sub-region, while son bias in education is the main manifestation of the unequal treatment of siblings in the West Nile sub-region; in Karamoja, son preference mainly manifests in terms of caring responsibilities.

Note: Indicators range from -2 for no discrimination to 2 for very high levels of discrimination.

Persistence of traditional gender roles across generations

Social expectations regarding gender roles within the private sphere are well embedded in Uganda: girls and boys do not enjoy an equal share of caring responsibilities. First, there are strong expectations that girls should spend more time on unpaid domestic work than boys across the country. One in three individuals agreed with this statement in Uganda; almost one in two in the Mid-Northern. This discriminatory social norm mirrors the reality of girls in Uganda. A majority of respondents declared that girls spend more time on unpaid care work in Uganda (57%). This is even higher in the Mid-Western and Karamoja sub-regions where more than two-thirds of people (66% and 77%, respectively) report unequal unpaid care work. Even in Central 2, the sub-region where the distribution of unpaid care work between daughters and sons is the most equal, 42% of respondents reported gender inequalities in unpaid care work (Table 10).

Across all sub-regions opinions are more favourable to equality than perceived practice. Respondents were 65% more likely to declare favourable opinions toward gender equality in caring responsibilities than their perception of the reality. Interestingly, sub-regions where the gap between opinions and practices is the largest are those where unequal practices in caring responsibilities are also more present: for example the gap amounts to 7 percentage points in the sub-region Central 2, where 42% of respondents perceived unequal distribution of caring responsibilities among siblings, but to 35 and 38 percentage points in the Kampala and Karamoja sub-regions, respectively, where more than two-thirds of respondents confirm unequal caring responsibilities.
Highlights from the focus group discussion

Participants in the focus group discussion reported that girls spend more time on domestic work compared to boys. The community considers domestic work as women’s work: it is the woman’s responsibility to prepare a girl for marriage through domestic work. “If you don’t teach your daughter domestic chores, she becomes an embarrassment to the mother when she can’t do any work in her marriage” commented a woman in Nsulumbi, Kaliro district.

Social norms and established perceptions on gender roles in the household are prevalent: men in Nakasongola see girls as more obedient, disciplined and as always being at home; on the other hand, fathers do not encourage boys to do domestic work because they believe it is the girls’ role to learn the skills of running a home as potential housewives.

In addition, in Isingiro and Dokolo districts, household work is distributed according to the gender, age and nature of the work to be done: girls do activities such as cooking and collecting firewood while boys take animals for grazing after working in the gardens with girls.

Second, the involvement of sons and daughters differs in the time devoted to them but also in the type of unpaid care activities undertaken. For example, social norms tasks such as fetching water and firewood, cooking food, caring for children, for the elderly and for the sick are more likely to be performed by daughters, while digging, construction, hunting and fishing are activities still mainly performed by sons. This gender-based division of housework is least common in Kampala, as 29% of the population agrees with such division of tasks, and widespread in the rural sub-regions of Southwest (63%), Mid-Northern (70%) and Karamoja (77%).

Towards equal allocation of resources

Regional variations are also remarkable in terms of equal access to education and health. Concerning son preference in education, even if one-third of Ugandans believe that higher education is more important for boys than for girls, only one in ten respondents agrees with unequal allocation of resources towards boys’ education. In Kampala, only 2% of the population agrees with such a statement, followed by the Central and Eastern regions (7% in Central 1 and East Central, 8% in Mid-Eastern and 11% in Central 2). In the Southwest and West Nile sub-regions, this view is shared by 10-14% of the population.

Highlights from the focus group discussion

The focus group discussion reported that boys are considered to be the backbone of the family: they are sources of economic strength and are able to support the parents and the clan members, and they are seen as hardworking and as more focused on education than girls.

The perception was that girls’ role is to support their marital homes. In addition, compared to boys, they are more likely to drop out of school due to pregnancy so parents viewed their daughters’ education as a waste of family resources. It was noted that girls develop physically faster than boys and eventually lose interest in education at puberty (15-16 years old). It was argued that girls have very little chance of completing their studies especially when they reach S.4, as they are pressured to or interested in getting married. A man in Kibaale said “I had four daughters but they all conceived before completing S.6 and I didn’t benefit anything out of my efforts to look for their school fees.”
Regarding household resources allocated to children’s health, almost all Ugandans are favourable to equity. This preference for equality is largely widespread across the country; the lowest prevalence of egalitarian opinion is in the Southwest sub-region, where one individual in ten responded that girls did not deserve the same investment of resources into their health as boys.

Table 10. **Selected son preference variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 2</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Eastern</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamoja</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Northern</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Nile</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Western</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: See Annex B for a detailed definition of variables.*

Restricted resources and assets

What does the restricted resources and assets sub-index measure?

This sub-index captures formal and informal laws, social norms, attitudes and practices that shape and determine women’s access to and control over productive and natural resources and assets. This includes discriminatory practices which undermine women’s rights to own, control or use land and non-land assets; social norms imposing that women’s assets be mediated only by men; discriminatory practices that restrict women’s access to financial services; and negative attitudes towards women’s formal employment and entrepreneurship.

This includes formal and informal laws, norms and practices that fail to guarantee women and men equal and secure access to resources. Anti-discriminatory legal frameworks have proven insufficient to fully protect women’s rights to resources and assets due to discriminatory opinions and practices. In 2004, the Ugandan government adopted a Land Act to improve women’s access to land and grant them the right to manage their property. Yet, despite this, discriminatory opinions and practices still persist in regard to women’s land rights. In some districts, the denial of equal rights to land across genders has been observed: the majority of the population disagrees with equal access and decision making and three-fourths of landowners are men. Further, decision-making powers are typically granted to men – twice as often – and most female landowners have no power to administer their land holdings as legislation does not prescribe co-ownership clauses. Instead, it specifies a warning indicating that a property is subject to consent before it can be sold or transferred.

Why is this important for development and for gender equality?

Insecure or weak rights to land, non-land assets and financial services, as well as restricted access to entrepreneurship have several negative development implications. For example, these discriminatory social institutions reduce income-generating opportunities for women, lower decision-making power for women within the household, increase food insecurity for women and their families, and make women and families more vulnerable to poverty (FAO, 2011; OECD, 2014c).

The various restrictions women face in their access to resources and assets mutually reinforce each other. Figure 18 shows that in regions where women’s access to land ownership and control are highly restricted, women face higher restrictions in access to financial services, for a given level of poverty. Discriminatory norms and practices that prevent women from accessing land are a major obstacle to women’s access to financial services, as most commercial banks will not approve loans unless women hold title deeds as a guarantee (CEDAW, 2000: 52). This constitutes a vicious circle: female-headed households are unable to expand their agricultural activities due to a lack of financial capital (Anríquez et al., 2010).
Women’s poor access to assets exacerbates this discrimination, perpetuating gender inequalities in employment opportunities and economic outcomes. For instance, restricted access to productive assets such as land and livestock reduces their capacity to generate income. With lower incomes, women are then limited in their ability to acquire further assets, and without assets to use as collateral, it becomes more difficult for women to access credit to purchase property and productive assets (O’Sullivan et al., 2014; FAO, 2014).

The lack of control over resources as well as the restricted access to and decision-making ability over credit greatly contribute to women’s disempowerment. According to the Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI), 57% of women and 37% of men are disempowered in Uganda (Alkire et al., 2013). Yet, securing women’s rights to land and natural resources and women’s agricultural empowerment plays a key role in ending poverty.

**How does the Uganda-SIGI measure restricted resources and assets?**

The sub-index is composed of the following indicators:

- Secure access to financial services
- Secure access to non-land assets
- Secure access to land
- Entrepreneurship

**Note:** The figure presents the relationship between discrimination against women’s right to access land and financial services, controlling for levels of poverty (share of population in the lowest wealth quintile). An $R^2 = 0.94$ means that 94% of regional disparities in restrictions on women’s access to financial services are explained by regional differences in discriminatory access to land and poverty levels.

How does Uganda perform in the restricted resources and assets sub-index?

With an average score of 0.630, women and men do not enjoy equal and secure access to resources in Uganda (a score of 0 means perfect gender equality). Figure 19 presents the regional disparities of this sub-index. Karamoja is the best performing sub-region followed by West Nile, Mid-Eastern and Central 1. Kampala displays higher levels of discrimination than the Ugandan average, such as Central 2 and Mid-Western. The highest levels of discrimination were found in the Mid-Northern and Southwest sub-regions.

Figure 19. Restricted resources and assets in Ugandan sub-regions

Note: The sub-index ranges from 0 for no discrimination to 1 for very high levels of discrimination.

Disparities between the highest and lowest performers are significant, especially in terms of entrepreneurship. Karamoja ranks relatively well with a score of 0.454, while the Southwest scores 0.894, suggesting that levels of gender-based discrimination related to resources ownership and control in the Southwest is twice the level of discrimination in Karamoja. This is mainly due to regional disparities in discrimination levels related to access to entrepreneurship. In Karamoja, women’s entrepreneurship is quite developed and there do not appear to be discriminatory norms or practices. Compared to the Southwest, where more than 40% of the population does not agree with equality in women’s and men’s decision-making power regarding the establishment of non-farm businesses, almost the whole population living in Karamoja favours equality (94%). This preference for equality is reflected in practice: women and men have equal access to business ownership, control and management in Karamoja, while men represent more than two-thirds of the business owners and managers in the Southwest sub-region.

Women living in Karamoja also benefit from a context where there are more favourable opinions regarding women’s ownership and control over resources:

- almost the entire population (96%) thinks that women should have equal access and decision making over real estate ownership
- 85% of the population declares that women and men should have equal access to and decision-making power over financial services (e.g. credit, microfinance, bank account)
only 14% of the population thinks that women and men should not have the same access and decision-making power on livestock and land assets.

Regional disparities in the manifestation of restricted resources and assets

Figure 20 presents regional disparities in the indicators used to measure the level of discrimination in women’s secure access to resources and assets. In Uganda and across its sub-regions, the level of discrimination in women’s access to resources is similar across the various assets (financial services, land and non-land assets [real estate and livestock]). This confirms the previous statement that gender-based discrimination in financial services is highly correlated with discrimination in access to land and non-land assets. Therefore, improving women’s access in physical inputs could have spill-over effects on women’s access to financial inputs.

Figure 20. Regional disparities in the restricted resources and assets indicators

Note: Indicators range from -2 for no discrimination to 2 for very high levels of discrimination.


Persistence of restrictions on women’s access to property

Despite the Ugandan Constitution upholding women’s rights to have access to property other than land, discrimination against women is still persistent in Uganda. While livestock ownership and management is equally distributed among women and men, two-thirds of real estate owners are men (including both joint and sole ownership). According to the law, women are free to administer their property without their husbands’ consent, but social norms prevent women from exercising these rights: one out of five people agrees that women should not have the same possibilities as men to take decisions on housing. Across the country, discrimination on rights over non-land assets is the lowest in Karamoja, which performs especially well in real estate rights, and strongest in the Southwest and the Mid-Northern, where one-third of the population does not confer the same decision-making power to women and men.

Discriminatory practices persist in regard to women’s land rights despite the adoption of the Land Act (2004), which was aimed at improving women’s access to land and at granting them the right to manage their property. Women provide 70% of agricultural labour and 60% of the labour used to raise cash crops, such as coffee, cotton and tea (Uganda Land Alliance, 2000, cited in Asiimwe, 2002). Despite this, women are still highly discriminated in land ownership: in Uganda, women represent less than one-third
of landowners (including both joint and sole ownership). In addition, women’s decision making and control over land assets are restricted. Managing land parcels are for the most part the responsibility of men (67% nationally; up to 82% in Kampala). In Kampala, women account for only one-quarter of landowners, in Central 2, they account for less than one-third. This reflects discriminatory attitudes towards women and land: almost one in three Ugandans believe that women should not have the same access to land as men. The result is considerably higher for the Southwest (43%) and the Mid-Northern (54%) sub-regions: this is particularly significant since both are predominantly rural, where land ownership may be more sensitive.

In addition, the nature of crops differs across gender. Women usually cultivate crops that are less profitable: female crops are usually cassava, beans, sweet potatoes and plantains, because they contribute to household food security. In contrast, male crops are the most productive ones: coffee and vanilla (Keller, 2003). Moreover, the Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Process draws attention to a widely known phenomenon: when there is a market for a food crop that was previously grown for household consumption, control over disposal of that crop passes from women’s to men’s hands. Therefore, poverty reduction resulting from a shift to market-oriented production would disproportionately favour men (UPPAP, 2002).

Those findings confirm previous evidence on Uganda. The Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index (Alkire et al., 2013) shows the gap that should be closed to achieve gender equality in five domains of empowerment agriculture (decisions about agricultural production; access to and decision-making power about productive resources; control of use of income; leadership in the community; and time allocation). In Uganda, only half of women have empowerment levels equal to that of the men in their households. For the other half of women who have lower levels of empowerment than their male household members, the gap is 22%.

**Highlights from the focus group discussion**

The focus group discussion reported that the land tenure system in some areas of the country like the north and east is based on customary tenure. This type of land administration further prevents women from owning land, as it is mostly owned by men due to socio-cultural biases.

Men are viewed as the head of the family, which gives them sole authority over the land. One participant in the Isingiro district in the west of the country said “Even if you worked with your husband and decided to buy a piece of land, the agreement/title will not be produced possessing both names but only possess the man’s names.” In the north, culture strongly delimits land ownership to men: one participant noted that “Women cannot own land culturally in Lango region. If she does the community may curse her…”

**Lack of collateral and restricted access to financial services and entrepreneurship**

In addition to restricted rights to access and manage land and non-land properties, women face restrictions in the use of collateral: even when women own land assets, livestock or real estate, only a minority may use them as collateral. That could explain persistent discrimination against women’s access to financial services and entrepreneurship. Women’s access to financial services is still limited. This appears to reflect discriminatory attitudes towards women’s financial autonomy: one person in five agrees that women should not have the same rights to access credit as men, and one in
every four people agrees that women should not have the same decision-making power on financial services. In addition, formal financial institutions often require the husband’s consent to open a personal bank account, despite the fact that the law does not require such a signature (Ellis et al., 2006).

The nature of the credit also differs by gender, at the expense of women’s entrepreneurship. Women usually have access to informal saving mechanisms and microfinance. However, these forms of financing are characterised by high interest rates, small loan sizes and their short-term nature. Therefore, women can become trapped in the informal sector and unable to expand their businesses (Ellis et al., 2006).

**Highlights from the focus group discussion**

The low involvement of women in formal businesses was explained by the focus group as a result of their lack of collateral necessary to borrow money from formal institutions. Women lack the right to own or control resources such as land, motorcycles, houses and electronics, which could act as the required collateral; the fact that cultural institutions put most of the control in the hands of men accounts for this.

In addition, participants noted that women are disadvantaged in accessing information and skills due to their household responsibilities, which prevent them from networking or obtaining information typically shared in small village centres.

Finally, women and men enjoy relative equality in access to entrepreneurship in Uganda, although there are differences among sub-regions. In West Nile and Karamoja, almost everyone believes that women should be able to establish their own business in the same way as men, but in Southwest, up to 42% of people disagree with such an egalitarian statement. This is reflected in practice: in Southwest women represent only one-third of business owners and managers compared to 56% in West Nile and Karamoja.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Opinion Access to land</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Opinion Access to entrepreneurship</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Opinion Access to housing</th>
<th>Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uganda</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 2</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Eastern</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamoja</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Northern</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Nile</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Western</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11. Selected restricted resources and assets variables**

Note: See Annex B for a detailed definition of the variables.

Notes

Restricted civil liberties

What does the restricted civil liberties sub-index measure?

This sub-index captures restrictions on women’s voice, participation and access to the public and social spheres. Restricted civil liberties encompass practices and social norms that restrict the mobility or movement of women and limit their access to public spaces and justice, as well as their inability to vote or run for election, as well as negative attitudes towards women as political leaders.

Quotas are used around the world to promote women’s political voice at the national and sub-national levels. In Uganda, the parliament has put in place legislative measures to increase women’s political participation through reserved seats. This requires that the national parliament has one woman representative for each of the 112 districts in Uganda. The female representatives are directly elected on a special ballot in each district. In addition, Article 180(2) of the Constitution mandates that women must make up one-third of local councils, which share jurisdiction with magistrate courts on decisions pertaining to local customs (The Quota Project, 2013). Nonetheless, social norms limit women’s political leadership. The number of women is significantly reduced in top leadership positions in the districts (chairpersons, speakers and chief administrative officers): after the 2011 general election, there were only 2 women (1.7%) out of the 112 chairpersons of districts and only 11 women (9%) out of the 112 chief administrative officers.  

Why is this important for development and for gender equality?

Women’s presence in community politics and both local and national government decision-making structures is relevant for a range of development outcomes such as governance, health and education. However, the inclusion of women in political leadership positions is restricted by discriminatory opinions. Negative attitudes towards women as political and community leaders are associated with a lower participation of women in politics (Figure 21, left panel), which in turn has development implications. Improved women’s political representation allows gendered understanding of local level politics and promotes the inclusive potential for local democracy. Countries having a higher share of women in national parliaments also have greater levels of governance (Figure 21, right panel).
Figure 21. Attitudes, women’s political participation and governance

Notes: The left panel presents the relationship between attitudes towards women’s political leadership (percentage of population that thinks that men make better political leaders than women) and women’s share in national parliament in 100 countries in 2014 controlling for the presence of quotas, regional characteristics and the country’s income level. An $R^2 = 0.66$ means that 66% of cross-country disparities in women’s political participation are explained by regional differences in favourable attitudes toward female political leadership, regional and income characteristics. The right panel presents the country’s level of governance (rule of law and accountability) by level of women’s political participation.


Research from other countries indicates that making institutions more representative and diverse favours inclusive growth and productive investment. There is evidence that greater equality between women and men in public decision making is connected to stronger democratic governance institutions, positive developments in education, infrastructure and health standards (Dollar et al., 2001). The equal participation of women and men in social and political life means that decision making is more likely to include a greater diversity of views and voices and thus has greater accountability to the population (Swamy et al., 2001). Communities with female policy makers tend to invest more in productive infrastructure and in the provision of public goods, such as water and sanitation (Chattopadhyay and Duflo, 2001).

Highlights from the focus group discussion

The focus group discussion reported that across all communities, women’s political participation was encouraged. Their role was not seen as different, better or worse than that of men. There was a widely held view that women are less corrupt, better financial managers, more approachable and transparent than men.
How does the Uganda-SIGI measure restricted civil liberties?

The sub-index is composed of the following indicators:

- Access to politics
- Domicile
- Freedom to move
- Access to justice

How does Uganda perform in the restricted civil liberties sub-index?

With a national average score of 0.783, the Ugandan sub-index score shows high restrictions on women’s civil liberties. Despite the existence of formal laws that protect civil rights, freedom and liberty of movement, women in Uganda still suffer from discriminatory social institutions that restrict their civil liberties in all sub-regions. Even in Kampala, the best-performing region for this sub-index, the score remains relatively high. Sub-regional disparities show that discriminatory attitudes and practices are most concentrated in the East Central, Mid-Northern, Mid-Western and Southwest than in the Central, Mid-Eastern, Karamoja or West Nile sub-regions (Figure 22). It is noteworthy that the sub-regional rankings in this sub-index differ from usual ranking in other dimensions captured by the Uganda-SIGI. The West Nile and Karamoja sub-regions are the second- and third-best performers in the civil liberties sub-index, while they perform the poorest in the Uganda-SIGI index.

Figure 22. Restricted civil liberties scores in Ugandan sub-regions

Note: The sub-index ranges from 0 for no discrimination to 1 for very high levels of discrimination.

Differences between the strongest and the poorest performers are less significant than for other dimensions of gender-based discrimination in social institutions, except regarding access to justice. The level of restrictions on women’s civil liberties is 30%
higher in the Southwest sub-region than in Kampala. The level of discrepancy between sub-regions suggests homogeneous attitudes and practices regarding women’s political representation across Uganda. However, sub-regional ranking highlights regional disparities in women’s access to justice. In the Southwest sub-region, women’s access to justice is two times more restricted than in the capital, with almost two-thirds of respondents declaring that women face discrimination when they try to access justice through courts of law, police or traditional local council.

The poor performances of the south-western districts to protect women’s civil rights are also explained by the negative attitudes towards female political voice. Even if most of the population would provide equal political opportunities to women and men (84%), 59% still believe that men make better political leaders than women do. Thanks to the implementation of quotas at the local level requiring one female representative for each district, women represent 40% of district councilors in the Southwest sub-region. This is the lowest level of female political representation in the country; however, some south-western districts, such as Kisoro, have women chief administrative officers (CAOs) and deputy chief administrative officers (DCAOs), while this is not the case in other sub-regions. This indicates that quotas and laws stipulating that these representatives be selected from an all-female ballot are efficient in increasing women’s political representation.

Regional disparities in the manifestation of restricted civil liberties

Figure 23 presents the regional disparities in indicators used to measure the level of discrimination in the restricted civil liberties sub-index. In Uganda, the level of restrictions on women’s freedom of movement is the most significant, followed by restrictions on their decision making authority over the choice of domicile of the married couple. However, this national interpretation hides large regional disparities in the manifestation of such discrimination. Women’s restricted access to justice is a major concern in the Southwest and East Central sub-regions, while a secondary issue for the West Nile and Karamoja sub-regions. Restricted decision making on domicile choice appears to be the main manifestation of women’s unequal civil rights in the Mid-Northern, Mid-Western and Karamoja sub-regions.

Figure 23. Regional disparities in the restricted civil liberties indicators

Note: Indicators range from -2 for no discrimination to 2 for very high levels of discrimination.

On the glass ceiling in political participation

Uganda’s policies and laws succeed in promoting the political participation of women. Quotas requiring one female representative for each district and laws stipulating that these representatives be selected from an all-female ballot have proven to be effective in promoting women’s representation in district councils. In Uganda, 42% of the district councillors are women. Regional disparities are quite low: the share of women as district councillors varies from 40% in the Western region to 45% in the capital. However, this national average hides some achievements in equality: in the Masaka district women and men have the same number of seats and women’s representation exceeds 30%, the minimum imposed by quotas. In other districts mainly located in the Mid-Eastern and Mid-Western sub-regions, women’s representation does not exceed 30%.

Nevertheless, women’s political voice is subject to a glass ceiling: persistent negative attitudes towards female political leadership limit women’s access to leadership positions. Even if the majority of the population agrees than women and men should have equal opportunities to run for political office, 60% of Ugandans believe that men make better political leaders. Such discriminatory opinions are mirrored in practice. Women represent only 6% of CAOs or DCAOs. One encouraging statistic is that the Dokolo district not only achieved 50% representation of women in the district council, but it also has a woman Deputy Chairperson, a woman District Speaker and three women district secretaries out of five.

Weak structures to guarantee women’s civil rights

Choice of domicile for a married couple constitutes another key civil right that is restricted in Uganda. Women’s participation in decision-making processes is limited by discriminatory opinions. Only one in four Ugandans believe that decisions should be taken jointly by both spouses, while two-thirds of Ugandans believe that only the husband should have this prerogative. Kampala is the least discriminatory region: 41% of individuals think that such decisions should be taken jointly by both spouses. On the other end of the spectrum, only 8% of people living in Northern and 14% of people living in Western agree that both spouses should jointly take decisions. Women’s freedom of movement is guaranteed under the Constitution yet is constrained in practice by social norms. Unlike men, women are expected to ask permission from their spouse before undertaking a journey away from home. Ninety-five percent of Ugandans agree that this restriction is justified for married women whereas only 50% agree that this same restriction should apply to married men. In the West Nile and Central 1 sub-regions, there is close to universal agreement that a married woman should ask permission from her husband before undertaking a journey away from home (Table 12).

Highlights from the focus group discussion

In the focus group discussion, the main obstacles to women’s voice have been attributed to negative attitudes towards women speaking in public. Moreover, politics and community development were seen as a male prerogative. According to one female Ugandan: “Men perceive women as a marginalised group, productive at home rather than developmental.” Across all communities, male respondents stated that a proposal made by a man is taken more seriously and is more vital for setting strategies and decisions for the community.

In some communities, women noted that men did not give them a platform to attend the public debates and that many feared speaking in public. Men argued that women’s participation is lower due to their household responsibilities.
Equal access to justice is also affected by discriminatory social institutions. Despite gender-equal provisions under the Constitution to guarantee women’s civil rights, they are often poorly protected due to patchy implementation and protection. This failure to protect women’s civil rights manifests itself in unequal access to justice, i.e. police, courts of law and local traditional authorities. One in three people believe that women do not enjoy the same opportunities as men to access justice. This figure hides heterogeneity amongst the regions, suggesting possible differences within the country in either perceptions and/or reality on women’s equal access to justice. Only 10% of residents in West Nile and 17% in Karamoja believe that women have unequal opportunities compared to men in accessing justice, in contrast to over half of the population in East Central and Southwest.

In addition to discriminatory social institutions, the obstacles restricting women’s access to justice include lack of physical access because of limited transport facilities, inadequate training and orientation of court staff, technical procedures, time poverty and inadequate representation of women throughout the justice system (Government of Uganda, 2002). Moreover, the local council courts set up to provide an alternative form of justice to the courts of law are reported to be too expensive. While these courts formally apply statutory law, their deliberations are often driven by customary law that may result in bias against women (Ellis et al., 2006).

Table 12. Selected restricted civil liberties variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Access to politics</th>
<th>Domicile</th>
<th>Access to justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Opinions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 1</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 2</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Eastern</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamoja</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Northern</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Nile</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Western</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Annex B for a detailed definition of the variables.

Notes


2. Ugandan Ministry of Local Government records.
### Kampala

Table 13. **Regional socio-demographic characteristics of Kampala**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Kampala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (thousands)</td>
<td>32 939.2</td>
<td>1 659.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female population</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini coefficient</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty rate (headcount)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Catholic (41%), Protestant (35%), Muslim (13%)</td>
<td>Catholic (34%), Protestant (30%), Muslim (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic group</td>
<td>Baganda (16%), Banyankore (11%), Basoga (8%), Langi (6%), Karimojong (5%)</td>
<td>Baganda (52%), Banyankore (11%), Basoga (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal sector employment</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>Men 16%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women 18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPI 1.14</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* The Gini coefficient measures income inequality by computing the deviation of the income distribution among individuals within a country from a perfectly equal distribution. A value of 0 represents absolute equality; a value of 1 absolute inequality. The poverty rate headcount is the percentage of individuals living below the national poverty line. The MPI measures individual deprivations regarding education, health and living standards. Informal sector employment is the share of informal employment to total non-agricultural employment. Access to infrastructures and access to financial services measure the shares of villages that have access to the indicated infrastructures and services. The GPI is the female-to-male ratio of the secondary education. Secondary education measures the percentage of the 13-18-year-old population attending secondary school.

Figure 24. Uganda-SIGI classification in the Kampala region

Notes: The map shows levels of discrimination through a spectrum ranging from light blue, which represents very low levels of discrimination in social institutions, to dark blue, which represents very high levels of discrimination in social institutions. The region of Kampala is constituted by one sole special district, the Kampala City Council Authority.


With a Uganda-SIGI score of 0.303, Kampala displays **low levels of gender-based discrimination in social institutions** (Figure 24), and is the least discriminatory region in Uganda (0.469). The region’s top national performance sees levels of discrimination at half the levels observed in Western (0.593), the poorest performing region in Uganda. In relative terms, women living in the capital are treated more equally than women in other regions across all sub-indices captured by the SIGI, except for the access to resources and assets sub-index.

Despite this strong regional performance, gender equality is still far from being achieved. Discriminatory attitudes towards women’s status and decision-making abilities in the private and public spheres persist (Figure 25). Women’s rights within the family as well as in public life are restricted by discriminatory attitudes and norms on appropriate gender roles. This spills over adversely on their economic empowerment opportunities, with ongoing challenges for women to own and access land and resources. Such restrictions on women’s empowerment opportunities are the underlying drivers of gender inequality.
Discriminatory family code

Kampala shows the lowest levels of discrimination in the family code (0.567 – the national average is 0.706); nonetheless, social institutions within the family still continue to discriminate against women.

Marriage customs are less discriminatory than in the rest of Uganda. In comparison to the rest of the country, there are significantly less early marriage practices in Kampala. Most women in Uganda are married before the age of 18 (from 50% in Western to 62% in Eastern), and this is widely accepted (by 45% of the Ugandan population). In contrast, one-third of women living in Kampala were married or in an informal union before the age of 18, but the majority were in a marriage or informal union after 20 (median age at first marriage of informal union), which was set as the minimum age of marriage by the majority of the respondents. In addition, while only one in five people in Kampala agrees that girls should be married before the age of 18, two-thirds of individuals in Northern accept such practice. Early marriage affects only 8% of men in Kampala; 5% of the population agree that this is justified.

Kampala is also characterised by more positive opinions on gender equality in respect to family rights and duties:

- three-quarters of the population agree that daughters and sons, as well as widows and widowers should have the same rights to inherit land and non-land assets
- three-quarters of the population declare that caring responsibilities should be equally distributed between the husband and wife when both work outside the home.

However, bride price and discrimination against female heirs are major issues that remain to be addressed:

- Although Kampala is the region with the second-lowest acceptance of bride price, in practice it is still perceived as: necessary for any marriage for almost the entire population (94%), and widespread (65%), because it provides a status to girls (89%) and ownership of his wife to the husband (59%).
While the majority of people in Kampala believe that women should be inheriting land parcels like men (70% for daughters, 65% for widows), only one-third think that they actually do have the same rights in practice. Similar trends are found also for the inheritance of non-land assets that are less unequally distributed among heirs: 40% of the respondents declare unequal treatment of male and female heirs.

**Restricted physical integrity**

Women’s physical integrity is better protected in Kampala than in the rest of the country. However, norms and practices still condone gender-based violence and restrict their physical and reproductive integrity. The capital is the best performer with a score of 0.390, well below the national average of 0.589, and in Northern, levels of discrimination in this sub-index are double that of Kampala.

Women’s rights to freedom from violence are poorly protected in the capital due to high levels of discriminatory opinions justifying spousal violence. Even if the prevalence rate of spousal violence against women in Kampala is half that of Mid-Northern, violence against women remains common: one in every four women was a victim of intimate partner violence in the last year, one in two over their lifetime. Moreover, women are more likely to be victims of spousal violence: women experience domestic violence 1.5 times more often than men. This may be explained by the opinion shared by one-third of the population that spousal violence against women is justified under certain circumstances. Finally, women in Kampala appear to accept that this is justified, and also struggle to seek legal support due to poor infrastructure: 50% of female victims stated that they never sought help to stop intimate partner violence.

Nonetheless, women’s sexual and reproductive health and rights in Kampala are better protected than in other Ugandan regions. Four out of five people believe that a woman has the right to refuse to have sex with her husband and to decide over contraception. In addition to better access to and knowledge about health services, such favourable opinions allow the majority of women living in Kampala to have their family planning needs met (83%), which is higher than in the rest of the country. However, early pregnancies are still common: 22% of adolescent girls have given birth in Kampala.

**Son preference**

Girls enjoy greater equality with their brothers in Kampala than in other regions: levels of discrimination are half those of the Southwest, for example. However, the sub-index score of 0.404 exposes persistent discrimination against the girl child. This is particularly important as women face restrictions leading to unequal treatment and lower value over their whole life cycle.

The strong performance of Kampala in this sub-index may be partly explained by favourable opinions toward equal treatment of siblings:

- There is almost universal support for the equal allocation of resources on health for girls and boys: 98% of the population believes that household resources should be equally distributed between the education of boys and girls, even if 26% thinks that higher education is more important for boys than for girls.
There is strong support for the equal distribution of unpaid care work between girls and boys: three-quarters of respondents think that housework should be equally shared between girls and boys.

Despite such positive attitudes, there appears to be a lag with actual practices and social expectations. For example, 60% of individuals report that girls spend more time on domestic work than boys and that tasks performed by girls and boys are gendered. Daughters are more likely to perform tasks considered as “feminine” such as cooking food, fetching water and firewood, and taking care of children, the sick and the elderly, whereas boys are expected to be responsible for “masculine” tasks, such as digging. This distribution of domestic chores reinforces traditional gender roles across generations, restricting women’s role to domestic and reproductive functions. The gap between opinions and practices points to the persistent obstacles to achieving equality between boys and girls within the household.

Restricted resources and assets

With a score of 0.640, women in Kampala face considerable challenges in accessing resources and assets: the capital is the second-poorest performer in this sub-index. Moreover, restricted access to resources and assets is one of the main manifestations of discriminatory social institutions in Kampala. Although there is strong support for women’s equal rights and decision making over land and assets, the capital is also characterised by the lowest share of female owners of land, housing and non-agricultural businesses in the country.

Despite opinions favourable to equality, there is significant discrimination preventing women’s secure access to land. Kampala is a predominantly urban region, where agriculture is less important than in other regions. Despite this, the underrepresentation of female ownership of land in Kampala is the highest of the country as land parcels are mostly owned by men: four out of five landowners are men in the capital compared to three out of five in the west of Uganda. Therefore, few women have the opportunity to use land parcels as collateral, to rent or sell it, thereby restricting their economic opportunities. This is in spite of favourable opinions towards women’s equal access to land. Indeed, a lower share of the population are against equal access to (16%) and control over (23%) land between women and men, which is lower than the national averages (27% and 31%, respectively). Similarly, while the population of Kampala expresses the willingness to guarantee equal access to real estate property to women and men, women are still discriminated in practice. Only one in ten inhabitants reveal gender-bias preferences towards housing access, nonetheless only 30% of housing titles are held by women.

More significant is the restricted access to entrepreneurship. While in Uganda business ownership tends to be equally shared between women and men, female business owners and managers are underrepresented in the capital. While only a minority of the population (8%) denies equal rights to establish non-agricultural businesses to women and men, two-thirds of non-agricultural business owners in Kampala are men.

Restricted civil liberties

With a score of 0.687, women living in Kampala are far from benefiting from equal civil liberties compared to men. Such discrimination of women’s voice and rights in the public sphere are the most restricted manifestation of discriminatory social institutions;
the score of Kampala in this sub-index being the highest. Nevertheless, women enjoy more rights in the public and political life in Kampala than in most of Uganda (which has an average score of 0.783), even if regional disparities are lower than in other SIGI sub-indices.

While laws and policies to promote women’s political representation have proven to be effective, discriminatory opinions towards female political leadership still persist. Progress toward gender equality in politics is remarkable: women represent 45% of the district councillors and 84% of the population recognises that women and men should have the same opportunities to become politicians. However, women’s participation in politics is still impaired by adverse social norms that see men as better political leaders: 54% of people have such discriminatory opinions.
Table 14. **Regional socio-demographic characteristics of the Central region**

| Central | 
| --- | --- | 
| Population (thousands) | 6,805.8 |
| Female population | 51% |
| Urban | 26% |
| Gini coefficient | 0.45 |
| Poverty rate (headcount) | 6% |
| MPI | 0.297 |
| Religion | Catholic (40%), Protestant (28%), Muslim (18%) |
| Ethnic group | Baganda (55%), Banyankore (8%), Basoga (6%) |
| Informal sector employment | 60% |
| Secondary education | 
| Men | 18% |
| Women | 28% |
| GPI | 1.57 |

**Notes:** The Gini coefficient measures income inequality by computing the deviation of the income distribution among individuals within a country from a perfectly equal distribution. A value of 0 represents absolute equality; a value of 1 absolute inequality. The poverty rate headcount is the percentage of individuals living below the national poverty line. The MPI measures individual deprivations regarding education, health and living standards. Informal sector employment is the share of informal employment to total non-agricultural employment. Access to infrastructures and access to financial services measure the shares of villages that have access to the indicated infrastructures and services. The GPI is the female-to-male ratio of the secondary education. Secondary education measures the percentage of the 13-18-year-old population attending secondary school.

Figure 26. Uganda-SIGI classification in the Central region

Central

Notes: The map shows levels of discrimination through a spectrum ranging from light blue, which represents very low levels of discrimination in social institutions, to dark blue, which represents very high levels of discrimination in social institutions. The Central region includes the sub-regions of Central 1 (southern districts: Kalangala, Masaka, Mpigi, Rakai, Sembabule, Wakiso, Lyantonde, Bukomansimbi, Butambala, Gomba, Kalungu and Lwengo) and Central 2 (northern districts: Kiboga, Luwero, Mubende, Mukono, Nakasongola, Kayunga, Mityana, Nakaseke, Buikwe, Buvuma and Kyankwanzi).


With a Uganda-SIGI score of 0.395, Central displays medium levels of gender-based discrimination in social institutions (Figure 26). It ranks second after the capital, Kampala, in the Uganda-SIGI, followed by the Eastern region. In comparison to the Ugandan average (0.469), there is less discrimination against women. The region owes its relatively strong performance to opinions and practices favourable to women’s equal status and decision making within the family.

However, gender equality is challenged by persistent discriminatory social institutions in the Uganda-SIGI sub-indices of restricted civil liberties and access to resources: ongoing weak implementation of laws, discriminatory customary laws, social norms and practices still have a strong and adverse impact on women in public and economic life (Figure 27).

There are significant sub-regional disparities in the level of discrimination in social institutions among Central sub-regions and districts. The southern districts of the Central 1 sub-region show lower levels of discrimination than those of the northern districts of the sub-region Central 2. This is particularly notable in the son preference sub-index, where the Central 2 sub-region shows higher levels of discrimination against girls in both caring responsibilities and allocation of resources. Similarly, women’s rights to freedom from violence and their reproductive and sexual autonomy are better protected in the Central 1 sub-region than in the Central 2 sub-region.
Figure 27. Uganda-SIGI and its sub-indices in the Central region

Note: The sub-index ranges from 0 for no discrimination to 1 for very high levels of discrimination.


Discriminatory family code

Despite lower levels of discrimination against women within the family compared to the rest of Uganda (0.706), women’s ability to enjoy equal status and decision making within the family remain a challenge in Central. With a score of 0.613, the region ranks second nationally following the top-performing region, Kampala (0.567). The southern districts of the Central 1 sub-region (0.608) display lower levels of discrimination than the northern districts of the Central 2 sub-region (0.619) in the private sphere.

Lower levels of discrimination against widows’ and women’s inheritance rights explain this relatively strong performance of the Central region. Widows are relatively less exposed to poverty and marginalisation: levirate marriage is not considered a common practice (17% of the population declares that the widow actually marries her deceased husband’s brother in Central against 67% in Northern) and almost half of the population (42%) agrees with protecting widows’ rights to remarry. Attitudes and practices of inheritance of non-land assets tend to be less discriminatory with respect to other regions: 80% of the population is favourable to equal inheritance rights between women and men (for both daughters and widows) compared with 55% in the west of Uganda. These regional differences in opinion are mirrored in practice. There is close to twice as many discriminatory attitudes and practices against the inheritance rights for widows in Western (61%) than in Central (34%). Such discriminatory opinions and practices are even lower in the southern districts of the Central 1 sub-region: 24% of the population declares that daughters and sons have unequal inheritance rights regarding non-land assets in this sub-region: this represents half the national average. Only 10% justify this discriminatory practice, which is three times less than the national average.

However, discriminatory practices and opinions still persist:

- Widows and daughters suffer as much discrimination as in the rest of the country when it comes to inheriting land, a condition that is expressed both in the attitudes of respondents and in their reported practices: 42% of the population thinks that widows have less rights than widowers when inheriting land, and 56% report discriminatory practice.
The majority of women were married before the age of 18 (the median age at first union is 17) and this is seen as acceptable (42% of the population sets the minimum age of marriage for girls before 18). Moreover, the gender gap in early marriage is significant: only one in ten men married before 18 years old.

Bride price is still a common practice (66%), which is perceived as necessary (89%) because it provides a status to girls (92%) and ownership of his wife to the husband (77%).

### Highlights from the focus group discussion

During the focus group discussion, respondents from the Central region expressed concern that if a girl was to inherit land and get married, her husband could influence her to sell off the land when they marry because women generally go to live with the man’s family. Moreover, if girls inherit wealth, it is transferred to another family. It is for this reason that boys reportedly inherit larger shares than girls in order to keep the wealth within the family. Indeed, in the district of Kayunga this rationale was seen to justify why girls and widows are not entitled to any inheritance.

### Restricted physical integrity

Although Central has lower levels of restrictions on women’s physical integrity than in most of Uganda (0.589), women’s rights to freedom from violence and their reproductive and sexual autonomy are poorly protected. With a score of 0.515, the region ranks second nationally for this sub-index. Women in the southern districts enjoy greater reproductive and physical autonomy; Central 1 (0.474) and Central 2 (0.556) are respectively the second- and fourth-best sub-regions nationally.

Despite ongoing attitudes justifying spousal violence, violence against women is significantly less prevalent than in the rest of the country. The Central 1 sub-region has the lowest percentage of women that have experienced spousal (physical or sexual) violence: 23% of women have been victims of intimate partner violence in the last 12 months and 36% in their lifetime, compared with 51% and 60% in the Mid-Northern sub-region. However, discrimination persists in attitudes: 65% of people believe that spousal violence can be justified. Such discriminatory opinions help explain why half of female victims of intimate partner violence have never sought help or told anybody, suggesting stronger stigma surrounding physical and sexual violence than in the rest of the country.

Women’s sexual and reproductive health and rights are better protected than in other Ugandan regions. Less than one-third of women have unmet needs for family planning, while the majority of the population (65%) agree that women should enjoy full decision-making power over contraception. A minority declared that a woman is not justified in refusing sex with her husband (24%). Finally, adolescent pregnancies are less widespread than in other Ugandan regions: one in five adolescent girls (less than 18 years old) is a mother or pregnant, and 18 is the median age at first birth compared to 17 in the East Central and Mid-Northern sub-regions.
Son preference

Daughters and sons are treated relatively more equally in the Central region than in Uganda as a whole (0.654), although a gender gap remains in the equal distribution of caring responsibilities between daughters and sons. The region is the second-best performer nationally (0.581). However, this result masks stark sub-regional disparities with the Central 2 sub-region scoring sixth (0.636), and Central 1 being the second-least discriminating sub-region (0.525).

Highlights from the focus group discussion

Most of the participants across Uganda said that they would prefer to have a boy rather than a girl if they were to have another child. Boys were seen to be preferable since they continued the family lineage and as custodians of inherited property, offered greater security and care to their families. In the Nakasongola district, boys are preferred because they are perceived as “the pillars of the family since the family heritage will be retained, unlike with girls where the inheritance is transferred to another family”. In addition, mothers who produced boy children were more respected by their husbands’ families.

The absence of son preference in the allocation of educational and health resources in Central parallels the Ugandan situation. Only 9% of the population believes that household resources should favour boys’ education, even if 34% thinks that higher education is more important for boys than for girls. In addition to sub-regional disparities in economic performance, these attitudes may explain why the region has the highest share of women with a secondary education and the lowest gender gap, after the capital (Amin et al., 2013).

Traditional gender roles are reproduced through the uneven distribution of care work, deemed to be “feminine” and a female responsibility. Differences between the northern and southern districts are in part explained by their views on the appropriate division of caring responsibilities between girls and boys. In Central 1, 26% of people think that daughters should not undertake a higher share of housework than sons, which is the second-lowest result nationally. In Central 2, 35% of respondents were in agreement, which is the sixth-highest sub-region. Central shows the highest levels of equality in the share of caring responsibilities; however, almost half of the population (48%) reports unequal distribution of tasks in time and type of activities. While daughters and sons devote a similar amount of time to domestic chores, the activity undertaken depends on the gender of the child. Girls are more likely to take care of children, the elderly and the sick, and to cook food; and boys to perform physical tasks, such as digging or constructing/fixing the dwelling.

Restricted resources and assets

Women’s economic empowerment in the Central region is significantly compromised by discrimination in access to resources. Moreover, it appears to be one of the main challenges in the region. The score of 0.638 in the restricted access to resources and assets sub-index puts the Central sub-regions with an above average national result, with both sub-regions ranking respectively fifth and seventh out of ten.

Social norms are an important factor in shaping economic opportunities as they influence gender bias in the distribution of labour as well as the ability to own or have decision-making power over income and household capital. The poor performance of the
Central region may be mainly explained by women’s poor access to entrepreneurship opportunities. While in Uganda business ownership tends to be equally shared between women and men, in Central, female business owners and managers are underrepresented compared to the rest of Uganda. This is particularly the case in the Central 1 sub-region, where women represent four out of ten business owners. This unequal access to non-agricultural business reflects discriminatory attitudes towards women’s entrepreneurship: 26% of the population of the Central 2 sub-region believes that women and men should not have the same opportunities to establish their own business. This is the highest national percentage. Similarly, discriminatory attitudes also influence the possibilities that women have to access land assets: 25% of the respondents agree that women should not have the same rights as men to own land. This mirrors the ownership of parcels, where only 32% of landowners are women.

In respect to non-land assets, gender biases see women enjoy greater access to livestock but limited access to housing. The region has the highest percentage of the population (23%) believing that women should not have equal access to housing assets. In addition, a majority of homeowners are men (70%). Other non-land assets related to livestock display less discriminatory attitudes against women’s ownership. Only 10% of the population agrees with unequal access to livestock assets, less than in the rest of Uganda (13%). Women are half of the owners or co-owners of cattle.

**Restricted civil liberties**

Civil liberties represent the sub-index where women in Central face the greatest discrimination, restricting their participation in social and political life. With a score of 0.766, Central fails to protect women’s civil rights and freedom of movement. Levels of discrimination across the Central 1 and Central 2 sub-regions are quite similar (ranking fifth and sixth).

The poor performance of Central is mainly driven by restrictions on women’s freedom of movement. Almost all inhabitants of the region (98%) believe that a wife should ask permission from her husband before undertaking a journey; this is higher than in any other region. In contrast, a husband is less obliged or expected to seek his wife’s approval (69%). Similarly, discriminatory social norms are also evident in questions on who should decide where a married couple should live: only 24% of the population declares that the wife should participate in decisions related to place of domicile; more than two-thirds believe that the decision should be taken by the husband or by his parents. Despite such restrictions, women do, however, enjoy access to justice: 25% of respondents reported unequal access to courts of law, police and local councils, which is slightly lower than the national average (31%).

Women’s political participation is hindered by negative attitudes towards their political leadership. Although a majority of the population (88%) believes that women and men should have the same opportunities in political life, 61% of the region thinks that men make better political leaders, in particular in the northern counties of the Central 1 sub-region (64%). This appears to spill over in the actual representation of women in leadership positions. While 42% of the district councillors of Central are women, only the Mpigi district has a woman as chief administrative officer (4 districts with female DCAOs out of 18).
### Eastern

Table 15. **Regional socio-demographic characteristics of the Eastern region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eastern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (thousands)</td>
<td>8 623.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female population</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini coefficient</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty rate (headcount)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Protestant (38%), Catholic (30%), Muslim (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic group</td>
<td>Basoga (35%), Iteso (19%), Bagiso (13%), Bagwere (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal sector employment</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPI</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** The Gini coefficient measures income inequality by computing the deviation of the income distribution among individuals within a country from a perfectly equal distribution. A value of 0 represents absolute equality; a value of 1 absolute inequality. The poverty rate headcount is the percentage of individuals living below the national poverty line. The MPI measures individual deprivations regarding education, health and living standards. Informal sector employment is the share of informal employment to total non-agricultural employment. Access to infrastructures and access to financial services measure the shares of villages that have access to the indicated infrastructures and services. The GPI is the female-to-male ratio of the secondary education. Secondary education measures the percentage of the 13-18-year-old population attending secondary school.

Figure 28. Uganda-SIGI classification in the Eastern region

Note: The map shows levels of discrimination through a spectrum ranging from light blue, which represents very low levels of discrimination in social institutions, to dark blue, which represents very high levels of discrimination in social institutions. The Eastern region includes the sub-regions of East Central (southern districts: Bugiri, Iganga, Jinja, Kamuli, Mayuge, Kaliro, Namutumba, Buyende and Luuka) and Mid-Eastern (northern districts: Busia, Kapchorwa, Katakwi, Kumi, Mbale, Pallisa, Soroti, Tororo, Kaberamaido, Sironko, Amuria, Budaka, Bududa, Bukedea, Bukwo, Butaleja, Manafwa, Bulambuli, Kibuku, Kween, Namayingo, Ngora and Serere).


With a Uganda-SIGI score of 0.425, the Eastern region of Uganda displays medium levels of gender-based discrimination in social institutions (Figure 28), which is slightly below the Ugandan average (0.469). The region is ranked third nationally, after Kampala and the Central regions. Discrimination against women spans across all five sub-indices of the Uganda-SIGI, although there are variations in levels and intensity.

The region’s rankings are strengthened by favourable opinions and practices in regard to equal access to land and non-land assets. It is the most successful region in protecting women’s rights to own and control land and financial assets. Moreover, women face fewer obstacles and discrimination in establishing their own businesses, and there appear to be equal opportunities for entrepreneurship regardless of gender.

However, women still face challenges in achieving equality in public and private life. High scores in the discriminatory family code and restricted civil liberties sub-indices reflect poor implementation of laws and the influence of discriminatory social norms on women’s low status and decision making within the family as well as in public life (Figure 29).

In general, the Eastern region is quite homogenous; nonetheless social institutions are generally more discriminatory in the southern districts of the East Central sub-region than in the northern districts of the Mid-Eastern sub-region. The northern districts belonging to the Mid-Eastern sub-region appear to be more effective in tackling discriminatory social institutions that restrict women’s empowerment than the southern districts of the East Central sub-region. This is particularly true for the civil rights and physical integrity dimensions.
Discriminatory family code

Women and men do not enjoy equal status and decision-making power within the family in the Eastern region, despite national legislation and initiatives. With a score of 0.704, the level of discrimination within the family is similar to the Ugandan average (0.706), and the region ranks third after Kampala and the neighbouring Central region. There are low sub-regional disparities. The northern districts of the Mid-Eastern sub-region (0.691) display less discrimination against women’s status within the family than the southern districts of the East Central sub-region (0.716).

However, both sub-regions show high levels of discrimination in regard to marriage customs. Early marriage of girls remains strongly supported and embedded in the norms and opinions of the region. The marriage of the girl child is more prevalent in the Eastern region of Uganda than in the rest of the country. Moreover, girls are more likely to be subject to child marriage than boys: the median age of marriage is 17 for girls and 21 for boys. In the Eastern region, six out of ten adolescent girls are married before the age of 18, three in ten before turning 15. In contrast, although one in ten adolescent boys will be in a union before the age of 18, none will be married before the age of 15. This practice is widely accepted: 42% of the population thinks that girls should marry before the legal age of 18.

Traditional gender roles associating women primarily with caring and reproductive roles are firmly entrenched in social norms and reflected in practice. Married women dedicate more time to unpaid care work than men. Women spend, on average, three times more time than men on caring for children, and twice as much time cooking. The uneven distribution of caring activities is supported by social norms: 31% of the population agree that this is justified, although there is heterogeneity within the region. In Mid-Eastern, 25% of people agree (3rd among sub-regions), in contrast with 37% in East Central (9th).

Despite persistent discriminatory practices and opinions, women’s inheritance rights over land are less restricted in the Eastern region than in the rest of Uganda. Two-thirds of the population of the Eastern region are favourable to equal inheritance rights between daughters and sons, as well as between widows and widowers. However, female heirs...
continue to face unequal treatment with respect to their male heirs: most of the population acknowledges that both daughter and widows have less rights over land inheritance.

```
Highlights from the focus group discussion

The focus group discussion reported that social norms and practices discriminate against women and girls in regard to inheritance rights over land. “A girl can only inherit land in the absence of boys in the family: if a girl is born alone then she can inherit the land and other property” said an elderly participant in the Luuka district (Eastern region).

Restricted physical integrity

Women’s sexual and reproductive health and rights as well as their ability to live free from violence remain tenacious in Eastern Uganda. With a score of 0.601, women’s physical integrity is highly compromised and mirrors the national average (0.589). However, discrimination in this sub-index is especially strong in the East Central sub-region, which is the second-poorest performing sub-region (0.634).

Reproduction and family planning appear to present the greatest challenges in the region:

- Adolescent pregnancy is particularly high: 30% of girls younger than 18 are pregnant or have given birth, which is 25% higher than the national average. This corresponds to the high prevalence of early marriage: more adolescent girls become mothers in the region, probably due to the high levels of early marriage.

- Unmet need for family planning is higher in the Eastern region than the national average. Four in ten women, two times more than in the capital, report unmet need for family planning. However, in contrast, women’s reproductive autonomy is well accepted, with 85% of the population agreeing that women do have the right to decide whether to use contraception or not.

Widespread attitudes and norms that normalise domestic violence undermine women’s physical integrity and ability to live a life free of violence:

- Seventy-two per cent of people believe that spousal violence is justified – 25% more than the Ugandan average.

- Thirty-eight per cent of women report having been beaten by their husbands in the last 12 months. This goes up to 64% in the northern districts of the Mid-Eastern sub-region in their lifetime, the highest figure in Uganda.

- Women in the Eastern region are three times more likely to be victims of spousal, physical or sexual violence than men.

- Stigma surrounding domestic violence explains the low reporting rates: 36% of women and 38% of men who suffered from physical or sexual abuse from their partner never reported it to anyone, or sought help to stop it.
In the focus group discussion, most women in the Eastern region reported taking their own decisions about family planning. Women’s larger caring role for children within the family means that family planning decisions disproportionally affect their lives. Men do not pay much attention to the number of children they have. As one woman from Mayuge stated, “we go for family planning without informing our husbands because they want to produce as many children as possible without looking at our health.”

Son preference

In the Eastern region, daughters face high levels of discrimination in comparison to their brothers. With a score of 0.601, levels of discrimination are, however, slightly lower than the Ugandan average (score of 0.654), and lower than in the Northern and Western regions. Overall, the Mid-Eastern sub-region (0.574) tends to perform better than the East Central (0.629) sub-region.

Social norms tend to favour sons over daughters in the region. About half of the regional population (47%) agrees that domestic chores should be distributed among children according to their gender: girls should collect water and firewood and cook food, while boys should be more involved in digging. Moreover, 32% agree that girls should devote more time to housework than boys. Such attitudes are witnessed in practice: the majority of the respondents report that girls do actually spend more time doing unpaid housework than boys.

Favourable opinions on the equal allocation of household resources between girls and boy testify to the willingness to provide similar treatment to siblings regardless of their gender. There is a widespread recognition of the importance of investing in children’s health and education irrespective of their sex: more than 90% of the Eastern population thinks that resources should be equally shared on the education and the health of boys and girls. Nonetheless, boys’ education remains a priority to the detriment of that of girls: 34% of the population thinks that higher education is less important for girls.

Restricted resources and assets

Women’ access to land and productive resources appear to be well protected in the Eastern region, scoring above the national average. With a score of 0.543, women face 50% less restrictions on their secure access to resources than in Western and 20% less than the national average.

Positive opinions on women’s control, ownership and decision making over resources, land and financial services support women’s economic empowerment in the region:

- Only two out of ten inhabitants believe that women should be discriminated against in land ownership or should have less decision-making power over land than men. Such discriminatory opinions are twice as widespread as in Western.
- Only one in ten inhabitants agree that women should not have equal rights to establish their own non-agricultural businesses. This is three times lower than in Western.
- Sixteen percent of the population believes that women should not have the same rights to use financial services as men in Eastern, against 30% in Western.
Almost the entire population (90%) declares that women and men should have the same opportunities to own their own home, much higher than anywhere else in the country.

Such opinions may help explain why women in the Eastern region are more likely to own property than in any other region in Uganda. Women and men enjoy equality in terms of ownership and control over livestock and non-agricultural businesses. Women also benefit from relatively equal access to financial services, although they are more likely to obtain credit from informal or micro-credit organisations, and men from formal financial institutions, suggesting issues with women’s access to formal credit. Moreover, women are greatly underrepresented in land ownership: only one-third of land titles belong to women.

Highlights from the focus group discussion

The focus group discussion reported that the current legal framework in Uganda grants women equal rights to co-own resources with their husbands. However, due to social norms, most married men cannot benefit from this legal promotion of women’s land ownership. As a woman in the Luuka district said, “We can only utilise land but not own it because we are just married and the man is the head and owner of the land.”

Many of the communities visited considered women to be the property of men and therefore with no entitlement to resources like land. A young woman in Buyende district said, “We are considered a part of men’s assets in this community, so we cannot own land”; the same view was shared in most of the sites.

Restricted civil liberties

In the Eastern region, discriminatory social norms considerably inhibit the participation of women in public and political life. With a score of 0.781, the region is the second least successful region of Uganda in protecting women’s civil liberties. Sub-regional disparities are significant. While the southern districts of the East Central sub-region exhibit very high levels of restrictions on women’s civil liberties (0.832), women in the northern districts of the Mid-Eastern sub-region face less discrimination in their civil rights and ability to participate in public life (0.730).

As in other regions of Uganda, laws and policies to promote women’s political participation have been effective. Quotas and women ballots for district councillor’s elections have led to relative equality, with 40% of the district councillors in the Eastern region women. Moreover, opinions are favourable to women’s political role: nine out of ten people think that women should have the same opportunities as men to become politicians. Even if the region is still far from equal representation, it has the highest female representation at the top political leadership positions: a woman presides as chief administrative officer in the Jinja, Budaka and Kapchorwa districts. However, women’s voice in the public sphere is particularly affected by the common belief that female politicians make worse leaders than their male counterpart. Two-thirds of the population share such discriminatory opinions towards women’s political leadership.

Women’s access to courts of law, police and local council for the enforcement of justice is one of the most restricted in Uganda: 50% of the population reports unequal access and discrimination against women’s access to justice.
### Northern

**Table 16. Regional socio-demographic characteristics of the Northern region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Northern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (thousands)</td>
<td>6,837.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female population</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini coefficient</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty rate (headcount)</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Catholic (62%), Protestant (25%), Muslim (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic group</td>
<td>Langi (17%), Karimojong (17%), Acholi (16%), Madi (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal sector employment</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education Men</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education Women</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPI</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* The Gini coefficient measures income inequality by computing the deviation of the income distribution among individuals within a country from a perfectly equal distribution. A value of 0 represents absolute equality; a value of 1 absolute inequality. The poverty rate headcount is the percentage of individuals living below the national poverty line. The MPI measures individual deprivations regarding education, health and living standards. Informal sector employment is the share of informal employment to total non-agricultural employment. Access to infrastructures and access to financial services measure the shares of villages that have access to the indicated infrastructures and services. The GPI is the female-to-male ratio of the secondary education. Secondary education measures the percentage of the 13–18-year-old population attending secondary school.

Figure 30. Uganda-SIGI classification in the Northern region

With a score of 0.521, Northern displays high levels of gender-based discrimination in social institutions (Figure 30). The Northern region is the second-poorest performing region in the Uganda-SIGI, exhibiting lower levels of discrimination than Western, but higher than Eastern and Central. Women and men living in Northern have unequal empowerment opportunities due to discriminatory laws, norms and practices that are relatively higher than in Uganda on average (0.469).

This region is characterised by social norms that consider women as dependent household members with restricted sexual and reproductive health and rights (Figure 31). The poor performance of the region is mainly explained by:

- discriminatory opinions and practices within the family leading to unequal decision-making power and status in the private sphere
- persistent harmful practices that threaten women’s physical integrity.

Sub-regional disparities are significant in both the level of discrimination in social institutions and the way such discrimination takes form. The western districts of the West Nile sub-region display the lowest levels of discriminatory social institutions in the Uganda-SIGI index (0.433) while the eastern districts belonging to the Karamoja sub-region reveal intermediate levels of discrimination (0.477). These two sub-regions exhibit relative strong performance in the restricted civil liberties and resources sub-indices. However, Karamoja performs poorly in the discriminatory family code sub-index compared to the West Nile sub-region. Finally, the districts of Mid-Northern
demonstrate high levels of discrimination in almost all the dimensions captured by the Uganda-SIGI (ranked tenth out of the ten sub-regions, with a score of 0.652).

Figure 31. Uganda-SIGI and its sub-indices in the Northern region

Note: The sub-index ranges from 0 for no discrimination to 1 for very high levels of discrimination.


Discriminatory family code

Discriminatory social institutions within the family are a leading factor contributing to women’s marginalisation in the Northern region of Uganda. With a score of 0.765, the region exhibits the second-highest levels of restriction on the female status in the family, after Western (0.784). However, there are strong variations within the region: the western districts belonging to the West Nile sub-region and the northern districts of the Mid-Northern sub-region have similar levels of discrimination to the Ugandan average (0.706 and 0.740, respectively), while the eastern districts belonging to the Karamoja sub-region are the least-performing in Uganda (0.850).

Women living in Northern face strong discriminatory attitudes and practices related to social norms around marriage. The majority of women (57%) were married before the legal age of 18; 28% before 15. Marrying early is even more likely to occur in the Mid-Northern sub-region, where the median age of marriage is 16.9 years old for girls and 21.4 for boys. Despite the law setting the minimum age of marriage at 18 for both boys and girls, favourable opinions towards early marriage continue to justify the practice in Northern: one-third of the population believes that girls should be married before the age of 18. In contrast, social norms do not expect boys to marry early, highlighting that such discrimination is biased against adolescent girls. While three-quarters of the population in the Karamoja sub-region accept girls’ early marriage, only one-fourth have favourable opinions towards boys marrying before the legal age.

These attitudes towards early marriage for girls are replicated in practice. Girls living in the Mid-Northern sub-region are six times more likely than a boy to be married before the age of 18: over six out of ten women were in a union before turning 18 against one in ten men. In addition, other discriminatory practices are also prevalent in Northern: bride price and levirate marriage are more widespread than in other regions of Uganda (92% and 67% versus 77% and 37% respectively).
Highlights from the focus group discussion

The focus group discussion reported the wide acceptance of early marriage and bride price practices. “Naturally from the age of 13-17 people are supposed to be married and this has been accepted culturally. If you do not get married when you are young you are expired,” said an elderly woman in Maracha. Another woman in Oyam said, “A woman whose bride price is not paid is always laughed at and she is the talk of the village, she does not have any value. She cannot walk with her head high”.

Restricted physical integrity

Violations and restrictions on women’s physical integrity in Northern are the most serious within the country. With a score of 0.707, the severity of the issues compromising women’s physical integrity is higher than anywhere else in the country and much more significant than in Eastern, the second-poorest performing region (0.601). Sub-regional disparities are significant and highlight the particularity of the Northern districts: in the Mid-Northern sub-region (0.918), the levels of restrictions on women’s physical integrity are 50% higher than the Uganda average (0.589) and in Karamoja (0.568), more than double compared to that of Kampala (0.390).

Sub-regional differences suggest that laws tackling gender-based violence are unevenly applied and implemented across the region. In Northern, the overall prevalence of spousal violence corresponds to the national average: one in three women has experienced spousal violence in the last 12 months. However, compared to the Karamoja and West Nile sub-regions, Mid-Northern is characterised by unsuccessful policies to address violence against women. The prevalence rate of spousal violence against women in this sub-region is double that of Karamoja: one in two women has been a victim of intimate partner violence in the last 12 months in the sub-region compared to one in four in Karamoja. The gender bias is even more prominent than in other sub-regions: women living in the districts belonging to Mid-Northern were eight times more likely than men to have been victims of spousal violence in the last year; this figure drops to twice as prevalent in the western districts of the West Nile sub-region.

Women’s sexual and reproductive autonomy is also undermined by discriminatory social norms. One-third of married women living in this region have an unmet need for family planning. Common views on women’s sexual and reproductive rights help explain the challenges women in the region face in this area. Only 43% of the population agree that women have the right to choose whether to use contraception; the majority believes that this is the husband’s prerogative. Similarly, the majority of the Northern population denies women’s right to refuse to have sex with her husband.

Son preference

Attitudes and practices highly discriminate against daughters in the Northern region. With a score of 0.740, the region is ranked fourth before Western (0.778) and well above the national average (0.654). The region is quite homogenous: Karamoja is the worst performing sub-region (0.775), followed by Mid-Northern (0.744) and the West Nile sub-region (0.702).

Such high scores are mainly driven by attitudes that justify a gendered distribution of household tasks. This in turn has negative repercussions on the empowerment opportunities of girls. Household tasks are perceived as being more
pertinent to girls. In Northern, half of the population declares that girls and boys should not spend the same time on domestic chores; and two-thirds declare that domestic activities performed by children differ according to their gender. This is reflected in practice: daughters spend more time in unpaid care activities at home and perform tasks usually carried out by women, such as child caring, cooking or fetching water and firewood. This distribution of domestic tasks following the expected gender roles is more significant than everywhere else in Uganda.

Social expectations in respect of gender roles are also reflected in the allocation of resources that families decide to spend on their children’s education: 34% of the population still affirms that higher education is more important for boys, which justifies why 12% of people think that households should spend more resources on boys’ education. Girls who are not in school experience threats to their economic security and health, and often face pressures to marry (Bruce, 2007). In 2011, attendance rates for girls aged 10-14 were generally high in Uganda, except in Karamoja, where only 60% of girls were in school. According to the Adolescent Multilevel Vulnerability Index (AGI), in the same region more than half of adolescent girls aged 10-19 were vulnerable at the individual, household and community level (Amin et al., 2013).

Restricted resources and assets

In the Northern region, gender discrimination in the access to economic and natural resources are less pronounced than in the other dimensions. With a score of 0.582, the region ranks second after the Eastern region (0.543). Women’s restrictions are 8% lower than in other Ugandan regions on average (0.632), and up to 35% lower than in Western. However, at the sub-regional level, the strong performance of Karamoja is worth noting compared to the discriminatory situation of Mid-Northern. With a score of 0.454, women enjoy better access to resources and entrepreneurship in those eastern districts relatively to the northern districts (0.781) of the region.

Opinions towards women’s rights to access resources vary within the region. While there is relatively low economic discrimination in the Karamoja and West Nile sub-regions, in Mid-Northern women face strongly adverse social norms regarding rights to access land and financial services:

- Fifty-four per cent of people in Mid-Northern think that women should not have the same rights to access and manage land as men, three times more than in Karamoja and West Nile (17%).
- Equal access to financial services such as bank accounts, and formal and informal credit is denied by 40% of respondents in Mid-Northern, twice as much as in Uganda on average (20%), even more than in other districts of the region (14% in Karamoja and West Nile).

Yet, despite lower discrimination in attitudes in Karamoja and West Nile, ownership patterns still reflect a bias towards men in the entire region: the majority of owners of land and real estate are men (65% and 59%, respectively).

Restricted civil liberties

Despite lower levels of discrimination against women’s civil liberties in Northern, challenges to fully provide equal status to women and men in the public sphere remain. With a score of 0.762, the Northern region is the second-best performer after Kampala.
Sub-regional disparities in this sub-index highlight the wide discrepancies in the expected social roles of women. Women face higher levels of discrimination in the sub-region of Mid-Northern (0.841, ranked eighth out of ten sub-regions). Districts belonging to the Karamoja (0.729, ranked third out of ten sub-regions) and West Nile (0.717, ranked second out of ten sub-regions) appear to be more successful in protecting women’s civil rights, even if women’s voice, participation and access to the public spheres are still restricted.

Women’s voice has benefited from Uganda’s comprehensive laws and policies promoting women’s political participation. This has seen important increases in women’s representation at the sub-national level: 42% of district councillors in the region are women; and four in five people think that all candidates should have the same political opportunities, regardless of gender. However, some districts still struggle to provide more seats to women than the 30% minimum set by the female ballot, such as the Arua district in West Nile. Discriminatory attitudes persist, creating a glass ceiling. Like in other regions, there are no female chief administrative officers. This reflects embedded social norms that consider a man to be a better political leader than a woman: 55% of the population in Northern, and up to 64% in the West Nile sub-region, agree with this stereotype.

Women appear to enjoy equal and unrestricted access to justice. Their access to courts of law, police and local councils for the enforcement of justice is reported to be unrestricted by 80% of the Northern population. This is especially true in the West Nile sub-region, where 90% of the population declares that there are no gender biases in accessing justice.
Table 17. **Regional socio-demographic characteristics of the Western region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Western</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (thousands)</td>
<td>9 012.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female population</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini coefficient</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty rate (headcount)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI</td>
<td>0.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Protestant (46%), Catholic (38%), Pentecostal (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic group</td>
<td>Banyankore (38%), Bakiga (19%), Batoro (10%), Banyoro (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal sector employment</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPI</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* The Gini coefficient measures income inequality by computing the deviation of the income distribution among individuals within a country from a perfectly equal distribution. A value of 0 represents absolute equality; a value of 1 absolute inequality. The poverty rate headcount is the percentage of individuals living below the national poverty line. The MPI measures individual deprivations regarding education, health and living standards. Informal sector employment is the share of informal employment to total non-agricultural employment. Access to infrastructures and access to financial services measure the shares of villages that have access to the indicated infrastructures and services. The GPI is the female-to-male ratio of the secondary education. Secondary education measures the percentage of the 13-18-year-old population attending secondary school.

Figure 32. Uganda-SIGI classification in the Western region

Notes: The map shows levels of discrimination through a spectrum ranging from light blue, which represents very low levels of discrimination in social institutions, to dark blue, which represents very high levels of discrimination in social institutions. Western includes the sub-regions of Mid-Western (northern districts: Bundibugyo, Hoima, Kabarole, Kasese, Kibaale, Masindi, Kamwenge, Kyenjojo, Buliisa, Kiryandongo, Kyeggo and Ntoroko) and Southwest (southern districts: Bushenyi, Kabale, Kisoro, Mbarara, Ntungamo, Rukungiri, Kanungu, Ibanda, Isingiro, Kiruhura, Buhweju, Mitooma, Rubirizi and Sheema).
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With a Uganda-SIGI score of 0.593, the Western region of Uganda displays high levels of gender-based discrimination in social institutions (Figure 32) and is the poorest-performing region in the Uganda-SIGI. Levels of discrimination against women are one-quarter higher than the national average (0.469) and double that of Kampala, the capital (0.303).

Discriminatory social norms severely restrict women’s empowerment opportunities and rights in this region. Women have limited decision-making power and participation within the family as well as in public life. Moreover, women’s economic role is blocked by restricted access to resources and assets; their role remains confined to domestic and reproductive roles. This is reflected in the Uganda-SIGI where the region is the poorest performer in four out of the five sub-indices: family code, son preference, access to resources and civil liberties (Figure 33).

Sub-regional differences exist, with the Southwest sub-region demonstrating higher levels of discrimination (0.641) than in the Mid-Western sub-region (0.545). The sub-regions also show differing levels of discrimination per sub-index: discrimination within the family code is stronger in the Mid-Western sub-region than in the Southwest, but lower in other dimensions captured by the Uganda-SIGI.
Figure 33. Uganda-SIGI and its sub-indices in the Western region

Note: The sub-index ranges from 0 for no discrimination to 1 for very high levels of discrimination.


**Discriminatory family code**

With a score of 0.784, the region shows the highest level of discrimination in the family code sub-index nationally, well-above the national average (0.706). Discrimination against women in marriage customs, inheritance rights and restricted gender roles are higher in the northern districts of the Mid-Western sub-region (0.819) than in the Southwest sub-region (0.749). This is especially due to social institutions that discriminate against widows and daughters in favour of male heirs, as well as the unequal distribution of unpaid housework between women and men.

Married women have a very low status within the family in the Western region:

- A girl is five times more likely than a boy to be married as a child: five in ten women were married before the age of 18 compared to one in ten men.
- Early marriage is deeply embedded in social norms, with 43% of the population agreeing that girls’ early marriage is justified.
- Bride price is a widespread practice: 98% of the respondents report that it is common in their communities, and 89% agree that a dowry gives more value to a girl.
- The unequal distribution of unpaid care work between women and men is the highest of the entire country; 40% believe this is justified even if both spouses are working outside the home.

Discrimination is particularly concentrated against widows:

- Widows’ inheritance rights are both restricted in practice (69%) and seen as justified by the majority of the population (55%), at 1.4 times higher than the national average.
- A widow’s status is interlinked to her inheritance, severely restricting her ability to remarry outside of her husband’s clan (20%) since this is seen as unacceptable by a majority of the population (66%).
Remarrying outside of her husband’s clan exposes a widow to property grabbing, which is widely accepted (91%).

Levirate marriage is reported as a common practice by 22% of the population.

**Restricted physical integrity**

With a score of 0.577, the Western region fails to ensure women’s rights to freedom from violence. It ranks third after the capital, Kampala, and Central for women’s physical integrity. Within the region, significant variations exist, with the Southwest sub-region displaying very high levels of discrimination (0.634) compared to the Mid-Western sub-region (0.520).

Spousal violence is entrenched in social norms. One in two inhabitants of the region believes that intimate partner violence is justified under some circumstances. Therefore, a man’s status as husband protects perpetrators of physical or sexual violence from being prosecuted. This is confirmed by the high prevalence rates: one in three women living in the Western region has been a victim of domestic violence in the last 12 months, and almost half (46%) during their lifetime. The gendered dimension of violence within the household is strong: the prevalence of domestic violence is three times higher for women than for men. Low reporting rates perpetuate the cycle of violence: 48% of female victims have never sought help or told anybody to stop violence.

Women’s sexual and reproductive health and rights are also curtailed by discriminatory social norms. Women in the region have little say on sexual life within marriage, with 44% of the population agreeing that women cannot refuse to have sex with their husband (up to 58% in the Southwest sub-region). Women’s participation in decision making regarding their own health and the use of contraception is restricted by social norms that grant full say only to their husband. Moreover, one-third of women have an unmet need for family planning.

### Highlights from the focus group discussion

The focus group discussion reported that alcohol and poverty are among the common causes of spousal violence against women. “When the men sell the produce from the garden grown by the women, they just drink all the money and when asked about the money, they beat you,” one woman in Kibaale district said.

**Son bias**

Son preference is the most serious and pervasive form of gender-based discrimination in the region. With a score of 0.778 (compared to the national average of 0.654), girls experience severe gender bias in comparison with boys. This is particularly the case in the districts of the Southwest sub-region, which is the lowest performing sub-region with a score of 0.815 and less prominent in the districts of the Mid-Western sub-region (0.741).

Girls’ rights and empowerment opportunities are restricted in various ways:

- For one-third of the population, higher education is considered to be more important for boys than for girls, justifying biased allocation of resources favouring boys’ education.
In the Southwest sub-region, one-tenth of the population agrees that intra-household of resources allocated to health should be prioritised to boys: this is ten times higher than in the capital, Kampala.

The unequal division of labour within the household creates larger workloads for girls: only 35% of the respondents report that they actually share the burden equally.

**Restricted resources and assets**

Women face severe discrimination in their economic rights and empowerment opportunities. With a score of 0.789, the region is the worst performer nationally. Discriminatory attitudes towards female economic empowerment restrict women’s ability to access financial services, entrepreneurship and control of resources. The Southwest sub-region is the worst performer (0.894) compared to the Mid-Western sub-region (0.683).

Economic activities are seen as a male domain with little room for women. As such, women should have fewer rights to access financial services (31% of respondents), land (40%) and livestock (19%) assets, and have lesser decision-making power over them (38%, 50% and 30%, respectively). Ownership patterns mirror these discriminatory attitudes. Women’s ownership rights are limited to livestock and only one in three land or real estate owners are women.

Entrepreneurship and running businesses are particularly biased in favour of men: 18% in the Mid-Western sub-region and up to 42% of people in the Southwest – compared to the national average of 16% – think women should not have the same rights to establish a business as men. This appears to explain why women represent only one-third of entrepreneurs.

**Highlights from the focus group discussion**

The focus group discussion reported that women’s ability to earn income through entrepreneurship or other forms of paid work often faces criticism and obstacles by their husbands. Participants highlighted fear of too much independence or potential infidelity as two factors influencing this resistance. In the Kabarole district, for example, one woman noted that “men have always not wanted us to work, thus stopping us from starting up businesses and only wish to see us as housewives”.

**Restricted civil liberties**

Women in the Western region are impaired by norms and practices that restrict their social and political life. With a score of 0.879, the region is the worst performer. The sub-index score exposes high discrimination against women’s civil rights and liberties. Both sub-regions display high levels of discrimination (Mid-Western: 0.877 and Southwest: 0.882).

Access to justice represents a significant obstacle for women in the Western region. Courts of law, police and local councils are important entities for the enforcement of justice, and impaired access to these structures implies lower protection of their rights. Women are perceived as being discriminated to access justice by 35% of the population.
in the Mid-Western sub-region and 60% in Southwest, more than the Ugandan average (31%) and any other sub-region.

Social norms still limit women’s freedom of movement and it is believed by almost the entire population (97%) that wives need their husband’s approval if they want to undertake a journey. In addition, the large majority (80%) also thinks that the decision on where a married couple should live should be taken by the husband alone or by his parents, but never by the couple together.

Traditional social norms on women’s voice in public life and political status remain and spill over into practice:

- 18% of the population in the Western region believes that women and men should not have the same opportunities to become politicians.
- 60% argues that men make better political leaders.
- Men are 60% of councillors, the highest gender gap across the five regions of Uganda.
Annex A
The Uganda-SIGI Survey

The Uganda-SIGI measures discriminatory social institutions that restrict women’s rights, empowerment and access to resources and power in Uganda. The Uganda-SIGI brings together comprehensive qualitative and quantitative information on informal laws, social norms and practices that discriminate against women and girls during their entire life cycle. The Uganda-SIGI measures discrimination against women in ten Ugandan sub-regions across five dimensions: discriminatory family code, restricted physical integrity, son preference, restricted resources and entitlements, and restricted civil liberties.

The overall objective of the Uganda-SIGI is to generate the first evidence base of social norms at the sub-national level, allowing for informed and targeted policy interventions to promote gender equality. The Uganda-SIGI is based on a nationally representative survey, covering all 10 regions (112 districts), which addresses the following sub-themes: background characteristics of the household, discriminatory family code, restricted physical integrity, son preference, restricted resources and assets, and restricted civil liberties.

The Uganda-SIGI survey covered all 112 districts in Uganda and field data collection was spread over a two-month period from June 2014 to August 2014. A total of 3,604 households and 5,716 individuals were covered completely. The two main modules administered during the survey were the Household Questionnaire and Individual Questionnaire for eligible males and females.

The sample

The sample was designed to allow for reliable estimations of key indicators for discriminatory social institutions at the national, rural-urban, regional and sub-regional levels separately. The sample was selected in order to be nationally representative and to allow for sub-national comparisons. The ten sub-regions, each defined as groups of districts, are as follows:

1. Kampala: Kampala City Council Authority
2. Central 1: Kalangala, Masaka, Mpigi, Rakai, Sembabule, Wakiso, Lyantonde, Bukomansimbi, Butambala, Gamba, Kalungu and Lwengo
3. Central 2: Kiboga, Luwero, Mubende, Mukono, Nakasongola, Kayunga, Mityana, Nakaseke, Buikwe, Buvuma and Kyankwanzi
4. East Central: Bugiri, Iganga, Jinja, Kamuli, Mayuge, Kaliro, Namutumba, Buyende and Luuka
5. Mid-Eastern: Busia, Kapchorwa, Katakwi, Kumi, Mbale, Pallisa, Soroti, Tororo, Kaberamaido, Sironko, Amuria, Budaka, Buduuda, Bukedea, Bukwo, Butaleja, Manafwa, Bulambuli, Kibuku, Kween, Namayingo, Ngora and Serere
6. Mid-Northern: Apac, Gulu, Kitgum, Lira, Pader, Amolatar, Amuru, Dokolo, Oyam, Agago, Alebtong, Kole, Lamwo, Nwoya and Otuke

7. Karamoja: Kotido, Moroto, Nakapiripirit, Abim, Kaabong, Amudat and Napak

8. West Nile: Adjumani, Arua, Moyo, Nebbi, Yumbe, Koboko, Maracha and Zombo

9. Mid-Western: Bundibugyo, Hoima, Kabarole, Kasese, Kibaale, Masindi, Kamwenge, Kyenjojo, Buliisa, Kiryandongo, Kyegyegwa and Ntoroko

10. Southwest: Bushenyi, Kabale, Kisoro, Mbarara, Ntungamo, Rukungiri, Kanungu, Ibanda, Isingiro, Kiruhura, Buhweju, Mitooma, Rubirizi and Sheema.

A sample of 4,365 households was selected for the Uganda-SIGI survey. The sample size takes into consideration the implications and logistical aspects related to the organisation of the teams of enumerators and the workload for data collection. A two-stage cluster sampling design was employed to generate a representative sample at household level. In the first stage, 291 enumeration areas from each stratum were selected using the 2014 Population and Housing Census list frame. Enumeration areas were grouped by sub-region and rural-urban location, then selected using probability proportional to size. At the second stage, a representative sample of 4,200 households will be selected from all the listed households within each enumeration area. This will be achieved by selecting 15 households from the list of households in each enumeration area by using systematic random sampling.

Focus group discussions and key informant interviews

Focus group discussions and key informant interviews were conducted in order to verify the pertinence and relevance of the Uganda-SIGI surveys. This process facilitates the development of the SIGI quantitative survey data collection instruments and provides qualitative highlights to the survey’s findings.

Focus group discussions targeted stakeholders involved in mobilisation of communities and those facilitating processes of women’s interventions at community level. This will also help to generate collective decisions on particular actions that specific groups may consider adopting to address issues concerning women rights in more collaborative ways. Focus group discussions were conducted with groups of stakeholders from different sectors including women’s organisations, local council leaders at village and sub-county levels (LC1 and LC111), including secretaries responsible for women’s affairs and the Uganda Police Force (UPF). Focus group discussions covered 28 enumeration areas which were randomly selected from the Uganda-SIGI sample, representing 10% of the total communities selected for the Uganda-SIGI Survey.

In addition, interviews with key informants were conducted. This involved a cross-section of persons with knowledge on women’s rights in the areas of study at district, sub-county and village level: community and health workers, resident district commissioners and assistant district commissioners; district officials, information officers, population officers and statisticians, medical officers, education officials, probation and social welfare officers, community development officers; officers in charge of police stations and officers attached to the family protection units at the various police stations; officials of non-governmental organisations and community-based organisations dealing with women, teachers, religious leaders and church-linked workers; community
health-based care organisations; international organisations dealing with women; and employers.

**The questionnaire**

First, standard questionnaires on background characteristics of the household used in previous studies, such as DHS 2011, were reviewed and questions revised where necessary to meet the survey’s needs. Second, the Uganda-SIGI questionnaires were jointly designed by the Ugandan Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) and the OECD Development Centre in order to fit the Uganda-SIGI conceptual framework.

The quality control implied approval by the Uganda-SIGI steering committee and pre-tests. This process detected any possible problems in the flow of the questions and helped establish the amount of time required to conduct the interviews. Moreover, all questionnaires originally written in English were translated into six local languages (Runyankore-Rukiga, Luganda, Lugbara, Luo, Runyoro-Rutoro, Karamajong).

The survey combined two modules:

- The Household Questionnaire, administered to the head of household or spouse, included household roster and socio-demographic characteristics of the members of the household, information on the principal dwelling.

- The Individual Questionnaire, administered to one male and one female adult member of the household, collected information on discriminatory social institutions. Respondents were selected for interview using the Kish grid among adults aged 18 years and above.
## Annex B
Uganda-SIGI indicator dashboard

Table 18. **Indicators and variables of the Uganda-SIGI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISCRIMINATORY FAMILY CODE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early marriage</td>
<td>Attitudes and practices related to girls’ early marriage</td>
<td>Attitudes Percentage of respondents setting the minimum age for girls’ marriage before the age of 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalence Percentage of 15-49-year-old women married before the age of 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance rights</td>
<td>Attitudes and practices that discriminate against daughters’ and widows’ inheritance rights over land and non-land assets</td>
<td>Land Widow Attitudes Percentage of respondents declaring that a widow and widower should not have the same inheritance rights to land, in opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practice Percentage of respondents declaring that a widow and widower do not have the same inheritance rights to land, in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daughter Attitudes Percentage of respondents declaring that a daughter and son should not have the same inheritance rights to land, in opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practice Percentage of respondents declaring that a daughter and son do not have the same inheritance rights to land, in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-land assets Widow Attitudes Percentage of respondents declaring that a widow and widower should not have the same inheritance rights to non-land assets, in opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practice Percentage of respondents declaring that a widow and widower do not have the same inheritance rights to non-land assets, in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daughter Attitudes Percentage of respondents declaring that a daughter and son should not have the same inheritance rights to non-land assets, in opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practice Percentage of respondents declaring that a daughter and son do not have the same inheritance rights to non-land assets, in practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18. **Indicators and variables of the Uganda-SIGI (cont.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Widow abuse</strong></td>
<td>Attitudes and practices that discriminate against widows’ status</td>
<td>Re-marriage Attitudes Percentage of respondents declaring that a widow and widower should not have the same rights to re-marry, in opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practice Percentage of respondents declaring that a widow and widower do not have the same rights to re-marry, in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inheritance Percentage of respondents declaring that a widow cannot keep the inheritance after re-married outside her husband’s clan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bride price</strong></td>
<td>Attitudes and practices related to bride price</td>
<td>Requirement Percentage of respondents declaring that marriage requires a bride price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ownership Percentage of respondents declaring that bride price provides ownership to the husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Status Percentage of respondents declaring that bride price provides a status to a girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practice Percentage of respondents declaring that bride price is a common practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender roles</strong></td>
<td>Attitudes and practices related to the distribution of caring responsibilities between wife and husband</td>
<td>Attitudes Percentage of respondents who disagree with equal distribution of household and child-caring tasks between men and women, when both are working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practice Percentage of women among caregivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESTRICTED PHYSICAL INTEGRITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-based violence</td>
<td>Prevalence, attitudes and stigma of spousal violence</td>
<td>Attitudes Percentage of women aged 15-19 who agree that a husband is justified in hitting or beating his wife for specific reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalence Female-to-male ratio of victims of spousal (physical and/or sexual) violence in the last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive autonomy</td>
<td>Attitudes and practices regarding reproductive autonomy</td>
<td>Stigma Female-to-male ratio of victims of spousal violence who never sought help or told anyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes Percentage of respondents who disagree with a woman’s right to decide whether to use contraception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual autonomy</td>
<td>Attitudes about women’s sexual autonomy</td>
<td>Prevalence Percentage of married women aged 15-49 with unmet needs for family planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage pregnancy</td>
<td>Prevalence of teenage pregnancy</td>
<td>Percentage of respondents who disagree with a woman’s right to refuse to have sex with her husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of 15-18-year-old girls who are currently mothers or pregnant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18. **Indicators and variables of the Uganda-SIGI (cont.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SON PREFERENCE</td>
<td>Caring responsibilities</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son bias in education</td>
<td>Attitudes that discriminate against daughters in terms of education</td>
<td>Preferences in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son bias in health</td>
<td>Attitudes that discriminate against daughters in terms of healthcare</td>
<td>Percentage of respondents declaring that intra-household allocation of resources regarding health should favour boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTRICTED RESOURCES AND ASSETS</td>
<td>Attitudes and practices that discriminate against women’s access to formal and informal financial services</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Micro-finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal savings programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18. **Indicators and variables of the Uganda-SIGI (cont.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure access to non-land assets</td>
<td>Attitudes and practices that discriminate against women’s access to non-land assets</td>
<td>Housing Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Livestock Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure access to land assets</td>
<td>Attitudes and practices that discriminate against women’s access to land</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Attitudes and practices that discriminate against women’s entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Producer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18. **Indicators and variables of the Uganda-SIGI (cont.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESTRICTED CIVIL LIBERTIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to politics</td>
<td>Attitudes and practices towards women’s political participation</td>
<td>Percentage of respondents declaring that men and women should not have the same opportunities to access political leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Percentage of respondents declaring that men make better political leaders than women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Percentage of women in district councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domicile</td>
<td>Attitudes towards women’s decision-making power over domicile</td>
<td>Percentage of respondents who disagree that married couples should determine together where they live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to move</td>
<td>Attitudes towards women’s freedom to move</td>
<td>Percentage of respondents declaring that a wife should ask her husband’s permission before leaving the household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to justice</td>
<td>Attitudes towards women’s access to justice</td>
<td>Percentage of respondents declaring that women and men do not have equal opportunities to access justice (local council, courts of law, police)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex C

### Correlation results

Table 19. **Pearson’s correlation coefficients**

#### Discriminatory family code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early marriage</th>
<th>Inheritance rights</th>
<th>Widow abuse</th>
<th>Bride price</th>
<th>Gender roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early marriage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance rights</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow abuse</td>
<td>0.4227*</td>
<td>0.8053*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bride price</td>
<td>0.6609*</td>
<td>0.4462*</td>
<td>0.5777*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender roles</td>
<td>0.6005*</td>
<td>0.4789*</td>
<td>0.3788*</td>
<td>0.1699</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Restricted physical integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender-based violence</th>
<th>Reproductive autonomy</th>
<th>Sexual autonomy</th>
<th>Teenage pregnancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender-based violence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive autonomy</td>
<td>0.8146*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual autonomy</td>
<td>0.5545*</td>
<td>0.7240*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage pregnancy</td>
<td>0.1255</td>
<td>0.1273</td>
<td>0.1176</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Son preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Caring responsibilities</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring responsibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.6395*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0.3967*</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Restricted resources and assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secure access to financial services</th>
<th>Secure access to non-land assets</th>
<th>Secure access to land</th>
<th>Entrepreneurship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure access to financial services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure access to non-land assets</td>
<td>0.8206*</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure access to land</td>
<td>0.4006*</td>
<td>0.7148*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>0.5963*</td>
<td>0.6884*</td>
<td>0.3695*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Restricted civil liberties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Access to politics</th>
<th>Domicile</th>
<th>Freedom to move</th>
<th>Access to justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to politics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domicile</td>
<td>0.4771*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to move</td>
<td>0.1312</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to justice</td>
<td>0.1393</td>
<td>0.0759</td>
<td>0.7018*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* * Significant at 10%.

*Source:* Authors’ calculations.
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Glossary

Levirate marriage: a type of marriage in which the brother of a deceased man is obliged to marry his brother’s widow, and the widow is obliged to marry her deceased husband’s brother.

Early marriage: is a formal marriage or informal union entered into by an individual before reaching the age of 18.

Discriminatory social institutions: formal and informal laws, social norms and practices that restrict or exclude women and consequently curtail their access to rights, justice, resources and empowerment opportunities.

Unpaid care work: all unpaid services provided within a household for its members, including care of persons, housework and voluntary community work.

Bride price: an amount of money, property or other form of wealth paid by a groom or his family to the parents of the woman he has just married or is just about to marry (compare dowry, which is paid to the groom, or used by the bride to help establish the new household; and dower, which is property settled on the bride herself by the groom at the time of marriage).

Non-land assets: refers to livestock, housing and non-agricultural real estate.

Gender-based violence: violence that is directed against a person on the basis of gender. Although it is difficult to distinguish between different types of violence since they are not mutually exclusive, gender-based violence includes: i) domestic violence, sexual harassment, rape, sexual violence during conflict and harmful customary or traditional practices such as female genital mutilation, forced marriages and honour crimes; ii) trafficking in women, forced prostitution and violations of human rights in armed conflict (in particular murder, systematic rape, sexual slavery and forced pregnancy); and iii) forced sterilisation, forced abortion, coercive use of contraceptives, female infanticide and prenatal sex selection.

Composite indicator: formed when individual indicators are compiled into a single index, on the basis of an underlying model of the multi-dimensional concept that is being measured.

Gender roles: sets of societal norms dictating what types of behaviours are generally considered acceptable, appropriate or desirable for a person based on their actual or perceived sex, usually centred around opposing conceptions of femininity and masculinity, although there are myriad exceptions and variations.

Teenage pregnancy: pregnancy in women under the age of 18 at the time that the pregnancy ends.

Secure access: the certainty that a person’s rights to land and/or non-land assets will be recognised by others and protected in cases of specific challenges.
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